

**Minutes of the
North Carolina State Board of Education
Education Building
301 N. Wilmington Street
Raleigh, NC 27601-2825
July 6, 2017**

The North Carolina State Board of Education met and the following members were present:

William Cobey, Chairman	Reginald Kenan
A.L. Collins, Vice Chairman	Rebecca Taylor
Gregory Alcorn	Todd Chasteen
Eric Davis	Olivia Oxendine
Amy White	Dale Folwell
Wayne McDevitt	

Also present were:

Mark Johnson, State Superintendent	Lisa Godwin, 2017 Teacher of the Year Advisor
Amanda Bell, Local Board Member Advisor	Jason Griffin, 2017 Principal of the Year Advisor
Bobbie Cavnar, Teacher of the Year Advisor	

CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTION

SBE Chairman William Cobey called the Thursday session of the July 2017 State Board of Education (SBE) meeting to order and declared the SBE in official session. Chairman Cobey welcomed all SBE members and advisors, staff, onsite visitors and online listeners. He noted that the Board would only be meeting one day this month and that all agenda items would be voted on as the SBE proceeded through each committee meeting.

Chairman Cobey welcomed Mr. Jason Griffin from Perquimans County, 2017 Principal of the Year, and Ms. Lisa Godwin from Onslow County, 2017 Teacher of the Year, noting that an official welcome will take place at the August SBE meeting.

Chairman Cobey also recognized and welcomed Mr. Geoff Coltrane, Education Advisor to Governor Roy Cooper, and explained that all board agenda items and links to live stream audio are located on the SBE eBoard website.

ETHICS STATEMENT

In compliance with the requirements of Chapter 138A-15(e) of the State Government Ethics Act, Chairman Cobey reminded Board members of their duty to avoid conflicts of interest and appearances of conflicts of interest under Chapter 138A. He asked if members of the SBE knew of any conflict of interest or any appearance of a conflict with respect to any matters coming before them during this meeting. There were no conflicts of interest communicated. The Chairman then requested that if, during the course of the meeting, members became aware of an actual or apparent conflict of interest that they bring the matter to the attention of the Chairman. It would then be their duty to abstain from participating in discussion and from voting on the matter.

PLEDGE OF THE ALLEGIANCE

Board member Dr. Olivia Oxendine was recognized to lead the SBE with the Pledge of Allegiance.

ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION

Mr. Reginald Kenan noted a conflict with regards to BSOP 1 – Career and Technical Education Incentive Grants – due to the Duplin County School System’s involvement in the grant and requested that he be recused from voting on this matter. Chairman Cobey requested that the recusal be noted in the record.

Chairman Cobey requested all individuals attending by phone to please identify themselves. Treasurer Folwell and Mr. Todd Chasteen both joined the meeting by phone.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

As the first order of business, Chairman Cobey drew attention to the full meeting agenda, which is available on Simbli eBoard and had been available for Board members review. He requested a motion for approval.

Discussion/Comments:

- There was no further discussion.

Upon motion made by Mr. Eric Davis, and seconded by Dr. Olivia Oxendine, the Board voted unanimously to approve the State Board of Education meeting agenda for July 6, 2017.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Discussion/Comments:

Chairman Bill Cobey requested a motion to approve the minutes of the State Board of Education meeting from May 31-June 1, 2017.

Upon motion made by Mr. Gregory Alcorn, and seconded by Mr. Wayne McDevitt, the Board voted unanimously to approve the State Board of Education meeting minutes from the May 31 – June 1, 2017.

Chairman Cobey recognized Superintendent Johnson for a report to the Board.

STATE SUPERINTENDENT’S REPORT

Superintendent Johnson highlighted a forty-seven percent increase in the number of tests administered online. He noted that many student feel online testing can be easier and less stressful, and that through online testing data is returned to students and teachers faster.

Superintendent Johnson also shared information about the Friday Medal Awards given by the Friday Institute in collaboration with the NC School Superintendent’s Association to seven Superintendents across the state. He explained that these awards are given to Superintendents for their own accomplishments in improving student learning and implementing digital age approaches to teaching and learning. Superintendent Johnson recognized these Superintendents as “leaning in” with personalization and digital age learning and thanked them for all the work that they do.

Superintendent Johnson also shared his attendance at a Reach Out and Read program event at the Wake County Child Health Clinic. Reach Out and Read is a national program that partners with physicians to prescribe books. Donations to the program can help buy books which children can take home with them. The event at Wake County Child Health Clinic recognized a donation by United Healthcare that will provide over 2,000 books. Superintendent Johnson reiterated the importance of teaching children to read early.

Superintendent Johnson also highlighted the annual cohort meeting of Cooperative Innovative High Schools (CIHS) and Early College leaders. Over 180 school personnel attended this meeting and shared best practices. He noted how this work empowers local leaders and assists with scaling innovation statewide. Superintendent Johnson shared how CIHS and Early College support of apprenticeships, internships and positive relationships with the business community are empowering first-generation college students to obtain both high school diplomas and associate degrees by graduation.

Superintendent Johnson also shared his visit with Book Harvest – a local program that focuses on life-long literacy. He noted that not all students are not fortunate enough to have new books. Book Harvest provides new books to students to support summer reading.

He also explained his visit to the Daniels Center. The Daniels Center is a Raleigh-based program that provides STEM education to at-risk and economically disadvantaged students beginning at age five. He shared the story of the first two graduates who have completed the program through High School and are now pursuing higher education.

Finally, Superintendent Johnson shared a success story from the CTE Division, and highlighted two students who have become the Microsoft Office Specialist US National Champions and will be going on to compete in the world championship in California later this year.

Superintendent Johnson also shared a video that highlighted the great work that our local leaders are engaging in with CTE. He noted the positive experience these students had in the program and how the experience will prepare students for all kinds of career opportunities.

In closing, Superintendent Johnson shared photos from the 2017 Governor’s School programs at Meredith College and Salem College.

CONSENT AGENDA

Chairman Cobey moved to the Consent Agenda, which is reserved for items that generally create little or no debate such as routine appointments, items that come for information purposes only, routine reports, and final approval of items that the Board has already discussed. Board members have always seen these materials prior to the Board meetings, and may ask that items be removed from the Consent Agenda to be discussed on an individual basis. He requested a motion for approval.

<i>Upon motion by <u>Mr. Eric Davis</u> and seconded by <u>Ms. Amy White</u>, the Board voted unanimously to approve the slate of Consent Agenda items as presented. (See Attachments EICS 10, SLA 1, SLA2)</i>

EDUCATION INNOVATION AND CHARTER SCHOOLS COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT
(Ms. Rebecca Taylor, Chair; Mr. Wayne McDevitt, Vice Chair)

CONSENT

EICS 10 – Girls Leadership Academy of Wilmington (GLOW) Enrollment Request

Policy Implications: General Statute 115C-218.5(e-f)

SBE Strategic Plan:

Goal 1: Every student has a personalized education

Objective 4: Increase the number of charter schools meeting academic, operational, and financial goals

Enrollment Growth Greater Than Projected in Original Charter Application

Presenter(s): Mr. Dave Machado (Director, Office of Charter Schools), and Dr. Deanna Townsend-Smith (Assistant Director, Office of Charter Schools)

Description:

Per NC General Statute 115C-218.5(e-f), beginning with the charter school's second year of operation and annually thereafter, a charter school may increase its enrollment by up to twenty percent (20%) of the school's previous year enrollment or as otherwise provided in the charter. If a school proposes to grow by greater than 20%, that growth shall be considered a material revision of the charter application and must be approved by the State Board of Education (SBE).

GLOW (New Hanover County) opened August 2016 and is currently ending its first year of operation and seeks to increase its projected enrollment each year by 100 students per grade level. The school is approved to serve grades 6 – 12. Approval of this request allows the school to utilize its enrollment plan mentioned in the approved charter, but not explicitly outlined in its projected enrollment numbers. Specifically, this approval allows full alignment with the approved charter application as the school was previously approved to increase its year one enrollment from 75 to 100 in July 2015. The specific amendment request is outlined in the chart below which details the amended student enrollment plan for GLOW. The first year of operation (in bold below) does not require SBE approval.

Academic School Year	Total Projected Student Enrollment
First Year	100
Second Year	200
Third Year	300
Fourth Year	425
Fifth Year	550

STUDENT LEARNING AND ACHIEVEMENT COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT
(Mr. Eric Davis, Chair; and Dr. Olivia Holmes Oxendine, Vice Chair)

SLA Committee Chair Eric Davis called the July 2017 Student learning and Achievement Committee meeting to order.

CONSENT

SLA 1 – Update to Graduation Requirements: Occupational Course of Study Requirements
Policy Implications:

SBE Strategic Plan:

Goal 1: Every student in the NC Public School System graduates from high school prepared for work, further education and citizenship.

1. Increase the cohort graduation rate.
2. Graduate students prepared for post-secondary education.
4. Reduce the percentage of students needing remediation in post- secondary education.
5. Increase student performance on the state’s End of Grade (EOG) and End of Course (EOC) Assessments and on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).

Goal 2: Every student has a personalized education

1. Increase the number of students who graduate from high school with post-secondary credit.

Presenter(s): Dr. Maria Pitre-Martin (Deputy State Superintendent), Ms. Sneha Shah-Coltrane (Director, Advanced Learning and Gifted Education) and Ms. Beverly Colwell (Consultant, Exceptional Children Division)

Description:

The Future-Ready Occupational Course of Study (FR-OCS) is a North Carolina Diploma option for students with disabilities whose primary postsecondary goal is employment. Currently, students participating in the FR-OCS are required to take both American History I and American History II.

The Department of Public Instruction recommends the FR-OCS graduation requirements be amended to reflect the following Social Studies requirements (1) American History: Founding Principles, Civics and Economics, and (2) American History I or American History II. In preparing students to be College, Career, and Community Ready, the addition of the American History: Founding Principles, Civics and Economics course would allow students on the FR-OCS an additional opportunity to develop knowledge and skills related to personal finance and citizenship to prepare students to become responsible and effective citizens in an interdependent world.

Recommendations:

The State Board of Education is asked to accept the proposed changes to the existing policy.

CONSENT

SLA 2 – Policies Governing Children with Disabilities

SBE Strategic Plan:

Goal 1: Every student in the NC Public School System graduates from high school prepared for work, further education and citizenship.

1. Increase the cohort graduation rate.
2. Graduate students prepared for post-secondary education.
4. Reduce the percentage of students needing remediation in post- secondary education.
5. Increase student performance on the state’s End of Grade (EOG) and End of Course (EOC) Assessments and on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).

Goal 2: Every student has a personalized education

1. Increase the number of students who graduate from high school with post-secondary credit.

Presenter(s): Dr. Maria Pitre-Martin (Deputy State Superintendent), Mr. William J. Hussey (Director, Exceptional Children Division), and Ms. Carol Ann M. Hudgens (Section Chief, Policy, Monitoring and Audit)

Description:

Policies Governing Services for Children with Disabilities (Policies) recommends a technical correction to the name of the monitoring mechanism “continuous improvement performance plan (CIPP)” to “LEA Self-Assessment.” The proposed change aligns with the language used in North Carolina’s State Performance Plan - Indicator #17: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). This plan reflects the requirement to establish a comprehensive, ambitious, achievable, multi-year SSIP, with Phase I analysis, Phase II plan, and Phase III implementation and evaluation, with stakeholder involvement in all phases, for improving results for children with disabilities. The monitoring mechanism currently known as CIPP has been amended to include these requirements. The proposed technical correction more accurately reflects the process outlined by Indicator #17 and aligns with reporting requirements provided to the Office of Special Education Programs for North Carolina’s State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR).

Recommendations:

The State Board of Education is asked to approve the proposed technical corrections to Policies at the July meeting.

Chairman Cobey noted the beginning of the committee meetings. He reminded members that when meetings are one-day in duration, the SBE will vote on action items and action of first reading items as the board proceeds through the agenda. Chairman Colby then recognized Mr. Gregory Alcorn, Committee Chair for the Business Operations Committee.

BUSINESS OPERATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING
(Mr. Gregory Alcorn, Chair; Mr. Todd Chasteen, Vice Chair)

BSOP Committee Chair Gregory Alcorn called the July 2017 Business Operations (BSOP) Committee meeting to order.

ACTION ON FIRST READING

BSOP 1 – Career and Technical Education (CTE) Incentive Grants

SBE Strategic Plan:

Goal 3: Every student in the NC Public School System graduates from high school prepared for work, further education, and citizenship.

Objective 3.1: Graduate students pursuing a CTE concentration prepared for careers.

Presenter(s): Dr. Maria Pitre-Martin (Deputy State Superintendent, Office of the Deputy State Superintendent) and Ms. Jo Anne Honeycutt (Director, Career and Technical Education Division)

Description:

The State Board of Education (SBE) approved the release of a Request for Proposal (RFP) for CTE pathway incentive grants available to local education agencies (LEAs) that evaluate and reward systems that are achieving positive outcomes as a result of career pathways implementation. These grant awards are for all students with a target to serve a significant number of high need, underserved or nontraditional participants in the career pathway. They demonstrate a consistent record of collaboration among pathway partners, including employers, and have targeted pathway metrics to provide evidence of positive outcomes for those served and the community. Funding is aligned with pathway outcomes such as work-based learning experiences, teacher externships, and professional development. These grants are designed to incentivize partners to generate more positive outcomes in their career pathway programs. Applicants are including a variety of strategies including additional staff, equipment, professional development, student's experiences, etc. The allocation is a one-time allotment but recipients will have the opportunity to apply in future offerings.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that the Board approves the list of grant recipients.

Discussion/Comments:

- BSOP Committee Chair Mr. Gregory Alcorn recognized Jo Anne Honeycutt to lead this item.
- Ms. Honeycutt reminded the SBE of the past presentation and approval of the RFP for CTE incentive grants. Ms. Honeycutt noted that the RFP was issued and applications were received the first week in June and that both DPI and community college staff had reviewed the applications. She explained that today's item was the approval of the list of awards for schools systems. The Community College Board would also be taking action later in July. Ms. Honeycutt requested funding for twenty-two grants using Perkins funds. According to Ms. Honeycutt, every applicant who met the requirements is being funded. She stated that a major requirement of the grant was to apply as consortia and therefore applicants who failed to meet this requirement were not funded.
- BSOP Committee Chair Gregory Alcorn asked with approval from Chairman Cobey to move BSOP 2 the August agenda.

Upon motion by Mr. Gregory Alcorn and seconded by Mr. Todd Chasteen, the Board voted unanimously to approve the Career and Technical Education (CTE) Incentive Grants, as presented. (See attachment BSOP 1)

Update on Contracts

ADJOURNMENT

Indicating no other business, BSOP Committee Chair Alcorn adjourned the August 2017 BSOP Committee meeting.

Chairman Colby then recognized Mr. Eric Davis, Committee Chair of the Student Learning and Achievement Committee.

STUDENT LEARNING AND ACHIEVEMENT COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT (Mr. Eric Davis, Chair; and Dr. Olivia Holmes Oxendine, Vice Chair)

SLA Committee Chair Eric Davis called the July 2017 Student learning and Achievement Committee meeting to order.

DISCUSSION

SLA 3 – Membership for the Driver Education Advisory Committee

SBE Strategic Plan

Goal 5: Every student is healthy, safe, and responsible

Objective 5.2: Promote healthy, active lifestyle for students

Presenter(s): Dr. Maria Pitre-Martin (Deputy State Superintendent), Dr. Benjamin Matthews (Chief Financial Officer for Operations, Safe and Healthy Schools Support), and Mr. Karl Logan (Driver Education Consultant)

Description:

The creation of an Advisory Committee for Drivers Education is included in the North Carolina Driver Education Strategic Plan as directed by the General Assembly in SL 2011-142 and approved by the State Board of Education (SBE) in February 2013. State Board of Education policy established the North Carolina Driver Education Advisory Committee and outlines specific roles and duties of the Committee in advising the SBE on issues related to the implementation of the North Carolina Driver Education Strategic Plan and any other aspects of driver education and traffic safety.

The Committee shall consist of up to a maximum of nineteen members from the following groups: North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, North Carolina Department of Transportation and Division of Motor Vehicles, UNC Highway Safety Research Center, North Carolina Driver and Traffic Safety Education Association, commercial driving schools, LEA coordinators/teachers, University/Community Colleges, Law Enforcement, North Carolina Department of Insurance, North Carolina Parent Teacher Association and a student representative.

The initial term of office shall be for two or three years, beginning July 1 and ending June 30. The State Board of Education shall designate two-year and three-year term limits for initial members of the Advisory Committee. Committee membership terms will be staggered, thereby permitting new appointments to be made while retaining some experienced members. All subsequent appointments will be two-year terms. A member could serve a maximum of two terms consecutively, with a required separation of two years before receiving a third term appointment. The SBE shall fill vacancies on the committee and shall approve reappointments to the Committee. The full terms may be served after fulfilling an unexpired terms.

Recommendations:

The State Board of Education is asked to review the names submitted to serve two-year terms as members of the Driver Education Advisory Committee.

Discussion/Comments:

- SLA Committee Chair Eric Davis recognized Dr. Ben Matthews to present this item.
- Dr. Matthews stated that the Drivers Education Advisory Committee was established in 2013 to continue the strategic plan for driver education. The Advisory Committee provides oversight and advice to the State Board of Education.
- Dr. Matthews noted to the SBE that Drivers Education would be conducting regional meetings in each district and would keep the SBE informed of when those meetings would take place.
- No additional comments were made.

Upon motion by Mr. Eric Davis and seconded by Mr. Reginald Kenan, the Board voted unanimously to approve Membership for the Driver Education Advisory Committee, as presented. (See attachment SLA 3)

This item is moved to Action on First Reading during the July 2017 State Board of Education meeting. (See Attachment SLA 3)

DISCUSSION

SLA 4 – Global-Ready School and Global-Ready District Rubric Enhancements

SBE Strategic Plan:

Goal 2: Every student has a personalized education.

Objective 2.3 Increase the number of schools designated as STEM or Global Education ready

Presenter(s): Dr. Maria Pitre-Martin (Deputy State Superintendent), Dr. Tiffany Perkins (Director K-12 Curriculum and Instruction), and Mrs. Helga Fasciano (Special Assistant for Global Education)

Description:

State Board Task Force on Global Education Commitment 4.2: Institute in concert with global education partners a Global-Ready designation for schools and districts that provides a process and incentives and addresses, at the least, the following: K-12 world language opportunities for all students; pathways for teachers, leaders and administrators to achieve SBE-recognized badging; career-ready employer requirements; global school partnerships; and local school board resolutions and plans on global education.

The proposed enhancements to the Global-Ready School and District implementation rubrics adopted by the State Board in 2015 are to show more explicitly the alignment with the SBE-adopted Digital Learning Plan

which has explicit references to global awareness. The proposed enhancements do not change the intent of the Global-Ready rubrics for implementation or designation purposes and will still meet the SBE Goal Objective 2.3. Enhancements will be shown in technical word changes for alignment or explanations which refer to the Digital Learning Plan as a resource.

It is recommended that these enhancements are adopted beginning with the 2017-2018 school year.

Recommendations:

The State Board of Education is asked to review and comment on the proposed enhancements.

Discussion/Comments:

- SLA Committee Chair Eric Davis recognized Ms. Helga Fasciano to present this item.
- Ms. Fasciano stated that the district rubrics were initially approved by the SBE in January 2015 and May 2015. She noted that since then the digital learning implementation plan has begun and under the rubrics for competencies and implementation for schools, global references have been made. Ms. Fasciano also noted that this was an opportunity to align references and provide clarification and gave several examples.
- No additional comments were made.

This item is presented for Discussion during the July 2017 State Board of Education meeting. (See Attachment SLA 4)

DISCUSSION

SLA 5 – Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Draft Plan

SBE Strategic Plan:

Goal 1: Every student in the NC Public School System graduates from high school prepared for work, further education, and citizenship.

Objective 1.1: Increase the cohort graduation rate.

Objective 1.2: Graduate students prepared for post-secondary education.

Objective 1.3: Graduate students pursuing a Career and Technical Education (CTE) concentration prepared for careers.

Objective 1.4: Reduce the percentage of students needing remediation in post-secondary education.

Objective 1.5: Increase student performance on the state’s End-of-Grade (EOG) and End-of-Course (EOC) Assessments and on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).

Presenter(s): Dr. Maria Pitre-Martin (Deputy State Superintendent, Office of the Deputy State Superintendent), Dr. Tammy Howard (Director, Accountability Services), Dr. Lou Fabrizio (Federal Policy Director), and Dr. Nancy Barbour (Director, District and School Transformation)

Description:

Section 8302 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), requires the U.S. Secretary of Education to establish procedures and criteria under which, after consultation with the Governor, a State educational agency (SEA) may submit a consolidated

State plan designed to simplify the application requirements and reduce burden for SEAs. ESEA section 8302 also requires the Secretary to establish the descriptions, information, assurances, and other material required to be included in a consolidated State plan. Even though an SEA submits only the required information in its consolidated State plan, an SEA must still meet all ESEA requirements for each included program. In its consolidated State plan, each SEA may, but is not required to, include supplemental information such as its overall vision for improving outcomes for all students and its efforts to consult with and engage stakeholders when developing its consolidated State plan.

The North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI) has been working on the development of its ESSA plan since early 2016 in terms of stakeholder engagement. The first draft of the ESSA State Plan was posted on the NCDPI website on September 29, 2016. The second draft was posted on December 22, 2016, and a copy of the third draft of the plan, dated May 1, 2017, can be found on the NCDPI website at <http://www.ncpublicschools.org/succeeds/>. However, a new draft will be posted on this site the last week of June prior to the SBE meeting on July 6, 2017.

At the July meeting, NCDPI staff will highlight sections of the State Plan that warrant specific SBE attention.

This item is presented for Discussion at the July and August meetings with Action scheduled at the September meeting.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that the State Board of Education approve the State Plan at its September meeting for submission to the US Department of Education by the September 18, 2017 deadline.

Discussion/Comments:

- SLA Committee Chair Eric Davis recognized Dr. Lou Fabrizio to present this item.
- Dr. Fabrizio noted that the SBE has been discussing the ESSA plan since December 2015. He clarified that the version included in the SBE materials is the fourth draft of the State's plan and the second draft that conforms with the current USED template. Dr. Fabrizio also pointed out the FAQ, which was also provided to the SBE, and was issued by the USED on June 16, 2017. Dr. Fabrizio noted that the purpose of the FAQ was to remind states that the USED is following federal guidelines and that each plan must meet the statutory requirements. He stated that the USED has given the first set of states 15 days to respond to the USED letters sent to those states regarding approval of their plans. Dr. Fabrizio then provided an outline of the remainder of the presentations on this board item.
- Dr. Fabrizio presented the ESSA revised timeline. He reflected on Chairman Cobey's comments from last month's meeting regarding the later posting of the draft plan. Dr. Fabrizio noted that DPI had received feedback on the State plan. He reiterated that it is still a draft and DPI can still receive feedback and make adjustments. Dr. Fabrizio stated that the plan will be submitted to the Governor for the Governor's review. He noted that the Governor does not have to approve the plan, but must be given thirty days to review it. Dr. Fabrizio said DPI, SBE and the Superintendent would hopefully be willing to accept any changes or suggestions that strengthen the plan. He clarified that the next steps include the August SBE meeting where the SBE will review any additional changes and the September SBE meeting where the SBE will be asked to fully approve the plan in order for DPI to submit the plan to the USED by the September 18th deadline. Dr. Fabrizio noted that the USED will send out information on the process for future amendments of the plan. He noted that approval by the USED does not block the SBE or Superintendent from making future changes. The SBE will be able to submit an amended plan following the USED process in a few years. Dr. Fabrizio

noted that the draft plan no longer has “hold for additional information.” He gave additional recognition to Ms. Donna Brown for her work in finalizing the plan.

- Dr. Olivia Oxendine noted the window of opportunity to make revisions to the plan and asked what would alert the SBE or DPI that changes are needed. She asked if there would be frequent information from Washington or LEAs about the success of implementation? Dr. Fabrizio responded that the SBE will be monitoring the long-term goals and annual measures in the plan over time. He noted that if we are successful meeting milestones, the SBE will have the opportunity to amend the long-term goals. Dr. Fabrizio reminded the board that we will be getting comments from the public about items that are not in the plan. He emphasized that the SBE and the State Superintendent can add other measures either to the School Report Cards or the SBE’s strategic plan.
- Gregory Alcorn asked about early childhood as a priority in earlier drafts of the plan. Dr. Fabrizio noted that the earlier template of the plan included a section on supporting all students – and that the early childhood community had provided language for this section. The new template did not include this language. He stated that he spoke with Mr. John Pruette before the meeting, and he has assured Dr. Fabrizio that this language can be inserted back into the new plan. Dr. Fabrizio acknowledged that the staff priority was answering the specific questions that the USED asked. Mr. Gregory Alcorn also asked Dr. Fabrizio to clarify that this was a form issue, rather than a support issue. Dr. Fabrizio agreed. He noted that exclusion does not mean that an item is not important.
- Next, Dr. Pitre-Martin began her presentation on the Theory of Action in the ESSA plan. She discussed personalized learning, highlighted the ongoing work across North Carolina that forms the vision for education in North Carolina. Dr. Pitre-Martin noted that part of the ESSA plan should share what our future vision is for students, as well as educators across North Carolina, even though there was not a specific question in the template. She explained that the definition of theory of action came from Mr. Richard Elmore’s work through Harvard University and that many of our educators are familiar with this definition. Dr. Pitre-Martin highlighted four things from the definition. First, that the theory of action should align theory to the realities of our work. Second, she indicated that the definition connects strategy to action to ensure good instruction and student learning. Third, Dr. Pitre-Martin emphasized the mutual dependency of many of our initiatives. Finally, she stated that our definition is grounded in research and evidence.
- Dr. Pitre-Martin presented a draft visual to give an overview of the vision for education in North Carolina. Dr. Pitre-Martin explained that innovation is critically important in education, but that it must be something that can be replicated and scaled up. Dr. Pitre-Martin listed three categories of initiatives presented throughout the ESSA plan: emerging initiatives (research or evidence-based strategies that we may pilot or may seek to validate through research before statewide implementation), promising practices (capable of replication and scaling), and proven programs (many years of implementation with positive outcomes for students). Dr. Pitre-Martin stated that all of this, if done well, will bring us to an adaptive environment for personalized learning.
- Dr. Pitre-Martin highlighted four best practices in personalized learning: competency based progression, flexible learning environments, personal learning paths, and learner profiles. As an example of competency based progression, Dr. Pitre-Martin discussed credit by demonstrated mastery – where students can advance and earn credit as soon as they demonstrate mastery of content. She noted that for educators that might come in the form of micro-credentialing and badging. She highlighted global education badging as an example. Dr. Pitre-Martin stated that a flexible learning environment is also critically important and that our digital world allows for this. She also explained the benefits of blended learning which combines digital resources and face-to-face instruction. For adults in schools, educators can take online courses. As an example, Dr. Pitre-Martin referenced the North Carolina high school math collaboratory. Third, Dr. Pitre-Martin noted the personal learning path – where students and educators can follow a customized path. She highlighted the

CTE pathways presented earlier in the day. She also noted CIHS, advanced program, and other areas that allow students to have a customized path.

- Mr. Wayne McDevitt asked how this manifests itself and if each student has an individual path. Dr. Pitre-Martin agreed that this is our goal. McDevitt asked how this aligned to a bill from a few years ago that prohibited personalized education plans. Dr. Pitre-Martin noted that his was a perfect segway into the fourth bucket.
- Dr. Pitre-Martin stated that learner profiles allow each student to have their own data through which they can track their own progress and strengths and weaknesses. Mr. McDevitt noted that this is done by the student, so it is not a violation of the statute. Superintendent Johnson added how he has observed personalized learning being implemented in Johnson County and shared the example of a student who was using this opportunity to work ahead beyond her grade level. He explained that he has shared this example with members of the General Assembly and the fact that this is happening in North Carolina right now. Superintendent Johnson highlighted CIHS, and the opportunity for students to work ahead and earn an associate's degree along with graduating from high school. He shared an additional example from a visit to Rowan County where he observed a student who described her own progression through North Carolina's standards. He shared that the student had progressed from below grade-level to grade level using her learner profiles and personalized path. Superintendent Johnson noted the benefits of building out these existing models further.
- Wayne McDevitt stated that he like the idea, but that this explanation had been tried with the General Assembly before, and the General Assembly had still moved forward with the bill. However, he understands the distinction that the student is controlling the personalized learning plan. Dr. Pitre-Martin reminded the SBE that educators are involved in the process as well. Mr. McDevitt noted that the SBE had been advocating for this for years. He agreed that this is already taking place, and that as we move away from seat time, this is the way to go. Mr. McDevitt emphasized that it would be helpful to make that distinction,
- Dr. Olivia Oxendine suggested that this represents a shift of responsibility for individualization in learning from the teacher to student. However, she then asked about the ongoing responsibility of the teacher to make sure that the student has shifted. Superintendent Johnson responded that the teacher is still the most important person in the classroom. He stated that many teachers today feel like they're members of the service industry – that they are blamed for student performance. He noted that personalized learning is happening and the vision is to scale it throughout North Carolina. He emphasized the need for teachers to guide students in critical thinking and problem solving. Dr. Oxendine indicated her agreement with the concept, but noted that as we explain ESSA statewide, it's imperative that we help classroom teachers understand how to make this happen with twenty-six or twenty-seven students. She agreed that it can be done, but will take commitment. Superintendent Johnson agreed that it will take commitment by the state to professional development and consistent support, including technology support.
- Mr. Eric Davis recognized Lisa Godwin to speak on the matter. Ms. Godwin stated that student accountability is huge. As a kindergarten teacher, she knows what student can do. She noted that at her school they are already using data notebooks in their classrooms based on the Steven Covey Leader in Me program. Ms. Godwin noted that teachers are taking on these challenges. She agreed that with proper programs and training it can be done from kindergarten on. Data are important, as is the self-awareness that a child has from the data. She expressed that this is a good thing if we can get around the previous legislative mandate.
- Mr. Eric Davis next recognized Bobby Cavnar to speak. Mr. Cavnar agreed that personalized learning is the way forward. He stated that one of the biggest challenges is the incredibly high rate of teacher turnover and teacher loss. He noted the 30% drop in enrollment at colleges of education in North Carolina. Mr. Cavnar reiterated the challenge we have in training teachers for personalized learning if they will not stay in the

profession. He said that it is difficult to get good at something like personalized learning in two years. A student's path may last ten to eighteen years. It requires people all along the way to be consistent. He noted that the tenure of administrators is also low. Mr. Cavnar agreed with Dr. Oxendine about the challenges faced by teachers.

- Vice-Chair Collins stated that he loved the approach and that it is worthy of being placed in the plan. He recognized that the secret to success in education is a high-quality teacher in the classroom and that teacher's ability to differentiate among a wide variety of students. However, he cautioned that we cannot make policy on anecdote. Vice-Chair Collins said we have many students who will be successful despite their teachers, others that are systematically left behind, and many in the middle. He cautioned that we don't slip back into teacher accountability – he noted that many good teachers are doing this work today. The issue is the nationwide ability to have teachers in a mobile society stay. Vice-Chair Collins said there are few teachers like Ms. Bell who spent their entire career in one school system. He cautioned that we put enough supports to be successful.
- Wayne McDevitt reminded the SBE that this shift will take work. He agreed with the Superintendent that this will take a lot of professional development – he noted the challenge that will arise when both DPI and LEAs are facing budget cut while also lifting a heavier load.
- Bobby Cavnar stated again that he agreed that personalized learning is the right way forward. What good teachers do every day is highly personalized. He builds relationships with students and sees what direction each one needs to go and designs curriculum and instruction accordingly. Mr. Cavnar agreed with the Superintendent, that to change the way the state thinks about education will require an amazing amount of professional development. He reiterated again that personalized learning is the way we meet the needs of students today.
- Dr. Oxendine recommended that staff come to the SBE with models or templates on a professional development plan for teachers. Personalized learning is personalized. Teachers will need some direction to focus their understanding of the definition of personalized learning as well as how to make that come true for twenty-seven students. Superintendent Johnson responded that in our vision, professional development for teachers will become more individualized as well. He noted the ready availability of technology. He also brought forth the need to work with the colleges of education and shared an example of a conversation he had with teachers in Rowan County about the needs in this area. Superintendent Johnson said this is why it is important we set the vision – because there are a lot of things to follow to make this a reality.
- Mr. Cavnar commended the Superintendent on his comments about the need for personalized learning for teachers. He noted that teachers have been asking for this statewide.
- Dr. Pitre-Martin noted that digital professional development coming from DPI will give a teacher the opportunity to start where they are – be it novice or accomplished. Dr. Pitre-Martin concluded her comments and introduced Dr. Tammy Howard.
- Dr. Howard began her presentation with the accountability model which is intended to be used for meaningful differentiation of schools across the state. Dr. Howard noted that the data from the accountability model will be used to identify schools that need comprehensive support and improvement as well as schools that need targeted support and improvement. Dr. Howard said that in looking at this model; the outcome is an index value (numerical value) where schools will be ranked. The bottom 5% will be looked at for comprehensive support and improvement. Dr. Howard pointed out that one of the directives from ESSA is that the data must be disaggregated. Not only do we want to look at the performance of all students, we want to know the specifics of students who are members of subgroup populations. She reminded the SBE that the 2017 budget bill specified the components of the accountability model for ESSA. In doing so, the General Assembly met the objective of aligning the existing school performance grades with the requirements of ESSA. Dr. Howard concluded that the likely intention of the General Assembly was to have one

accountability system in North Carolina. Before beginning a detailed description of the models, Dr. Howard noted that North Carolina will continue to report a school performance grade for elementary and middle schools for English language arts/reading and mathematics. She said that North Carolina will also report performance for subgroups. Referring to the actual plan beginning on page 29, Dr. Howard stated that for elementary and middle school students test scores in English language arts/reading and mathematics will be included. For schools that have grade eight, NC Math 1 grades will be included as well. She noted that we will report level 3 and above in accordance with state statutes. Dr. Howard identified the other academic indicator as science at grade five and grade eight. As required by ESSA, we will include English learners progress as well. This will be measured by looking at student progress on English proficiency skills between entry and exit from the program. Students will be considered to be making progress if they are meeting the targets along the way. Dr. Howard reminded the SBE that many schools do not have many English learners. A school would have to have 30 students across grades to have this included in the model. Dr. Howard identified the school quality or student success indicator as growth based on English language arts/reading, math, and science scores. She noted that the breakdown between academic achievement indicators and school quality or student success is the breakdown the SBE is familiar with from school performance grades – 80% being the academic achievement indicator and 20% being the growth measure. Dr. Howard reminded the SBE that the budget bill indicated a 10-point rating scale for school performance grades. She confirmed that the General Assembly will continue to honor previous legislation that allowed an exception from the 10-point rating scale to using a 15-point rating scale for 2016-2017, 2017-2018, and 2018-2019.

- Dr. Oxendine asked whether the reference to the 10 point in the budget bill will stay, or if the General Assembly will extract this language. What is the assumption after 2018-2019? Dr. Howard noted that the citations in the law should show that the 15 point is still in place. Wayne McDevitt noted that it would take a proactive action by the General Assembly to change it back to 10. Dr. Howard noted that the 15-point rating scale is an exception for a specified time period. Mr. McDevitt asked for further clarification. Cecilia Holden provided additional information about her previous conversations with the General Assembly that the 15-point scale exception is still in place and that it will automatically convert to the 10 point scale in the future.
- Dr. Howard then transitioned to a presentation of the high school model. The academic achievement indicators are English II and NC math I, or NC math III. She explained that the implementation of new policies for grade 8 math will require the addition of NC math III for students taking NC math I in eighth grade. Dr. Howard also noted the four-year cohort graduation rate. She reiterated that there was much discussion around a five-year cohort graduation rate allowed under ESSA. It's anticipated that the five-year rate will be reported on the NC Report Card. Dr. Howard said that English learners progress is the same as the elementary and middle school models. Finally, she identified growth as including all assessments that are included in the model. She noted that there are other academic indicators that are specified in the budget legislation – including math course rigor (percent of students who successfully pass NC Math III based on teacher grades), ACT and ACT Work Keys, as well as biology. Dr. Howard specifically pointed out that we may have some feedback during peer review regarding how other academic indicators are being presented. The ESSA plan cites North Carolina law – there is one twist that may or may not meet as perspective in the federal law. She also mentioned the thirty-six K-2 schools in North Carolina which will not have any accountability data. Dr. Howard reminded the board that during NC Child Left Behind, these schools “inherited” the status of school of which the majority of students subsequently attend. We are required to have a provision for these schools under ESSA, therefore, the same model is outlined on page 36 of the plan. She also noted that if a “feeder school” is identified as CSI or TSI, the feeder school will also inherit that status.
- Vice-Chair Collins asked whether our schools will be chiefly evaluated based on EVAAS. Dr. Howard confirmed that 80% is achievement (percent that are proficient on state assessments). Only the growth

measure is EVAAS (20% of the total). She said that most the measures are students meeting a certain benchmark.

- Wayne McDevitt reiterated Dr. Fabrizio's earlier comments that just because an item is not listed, does not mean it is not a high priority. He expressed his concern that the accountability not become our priority, and nothing else. He specifically cited the Whole Child Model, the SBE strategic plan, ESSA, and a lot of things that the SBE's work is based on. He noted that there are a lot of things that he would like to raise as part of the ESSA plan, but is hearing that we will have that as a state priority elsewhere. Dr. Howard reflected that there are two areas that he sees other indicators – programs and NC Report Cards. NC Report Cards are wide-open, with the only limitation being the ability to collect the data in a way that is standardized and fair and equitable across the state. She cited chronic absenteeism as an example that could be included in the NC Report Card
- Vice-Chair Collins reiterated the issue that Mr. McDevitt raised. He shared the perspective that there are indicators that if included, would raise the grade of the school, which the current legislation does not say isn't important, just doesn't overcome a deficiency in proficiency. Vice-Chair Collins presented chronic absenteeism as an example. Dr. Howard noted that there were differing opinions on chronic absenteeism as a measure.
- Dr. Oxendine asked Dr. Howard to return to the point about feeder schools and the grade received by these feeder schools. Dr. Howard further clarified her earlier comments about the thirty-six K-2 schools.
- Mr. Davis asked a further follow up question related to the percentage of students who attend the receiving school. If a given receiving school is made up of mostly students from a different feeder school, does that change the impact? Dr. Howard noted that we have never really addressed that. She acknowledged that she will add to the list for further presentation in August.
- The Chairman adjourned the SBE for a 10-minute break.
- Dr. Howard began her presentation of the interim progress and long-term goals. North Carolina is required to set long-term goals for increasing student achievement and closing achievement gaps. North Carolina must show interim progress on English language arts/reading and math, English learners progress and English proficiency, and four-year cohort graduation rate by subgroups. To do this, we used college and career readiness (level four and above) expectations. A tool was used to identify a gap between two groups – in this case economically disadvantaged and non-economically disadvantaged. By inputting the desire to reduce this gap over ten years, it had the effect of charting outcomes for all other subgroups. Dr. Howard walked the SBE through the tables provided. Currently, 47% of students are meeting level 4 or above achievement level. In order to increase that by 20% to the new target of 67.1%, each year there must be an increase of 2.008%. These goals were increased from 1% after the May 2017 SBE planning session. Current goals will leave nearly all subgroups at above 50% at the end of 10 years. Students with disabilities is slightly under at 44%, however, they are starting at 14.1%, thus making this a very aspirational goal. The gap will not be closed at the end of 10 years, but it will be reduced at the end of 10 years.
- Among the states that have already submitted their plans, Dr. Tammy Howard noted that some of the feedback has suggested their goals have not been aspirational enough. The intent of ESSA was to provide flexibility of the states and to be a less prescriptive model than NC Child Left Behind. Despite this, Dr. Howard indicated that the recommended current goals are aspirational. In addition, the SBE will have flexibility to expand the goals in the future.
- Amanda Bell asked about the support that will be provided to schools to assist with meeting goals for the cohort groups. Dr. Howard noted that the ESSA goals set out only the measurements, and referenced back to the Theory of Action, which highlights the programs and work to be done to improve outcomes. Dr. Pitre-Martin noted three categories to provide support: curriculum, instruction, and assessment. Dr. Pitre-Martin,

stated the importance of encouraging the use of materials that are aligned to the standards and supporting the schools in teaching those standards with high-quality materials. Second, she mentioned support for quality instructional practices to teach content standards. Finally, Dr. Pitre-Martin referenced the use of formative assessments to inform instruction.

- Lisa Godwin highlighted that there are factors that are outside of the teacher's control. She praised the Whole Child Model as encouraging the additional counseling, social services, health services, and nutrition. It is difficult for even the best teacher to reach a student who is struggling with hunger or abuse. This is an important additional component.
- Mr. Davis commented that these goals are not just DPI, SBE, LEA or charter school goals. These are goals for the entire State of North Carolina. Mr. Eric Davis stated that in his view, we are starving our public school system. To achieve these goals, we must put our money where our goals are. We must support our teachers and our students before they come to school.
- Dr. Oxendine, noted the usefulness of the table before our school districts. Districts will need to focus on targeted strategies and instruction to reach the goals. This will require a lot of finely tuned work to get there. Dr. Oxendine raised an additional question about longitudinal data and if we had data to show how we have closed the achievement gap over the last ten years. Dr. Howard said that she would have to go back and look further, but recalls some tables that show a reduction in the achievement gap over the past ten years at a rate of 1-2 points a year. She noted context and that testing changes and content standards likely impacted as well. School level gains are different.
- Vice-Chair Collins shared his comment to the Superintendent at the break that the current plan is a whole lot better then where we started. However, he is troubled that the legislative proficiency mandates mean that we are locking in high stakes testing for a long time. He is interested in how we achieve proficiencies while informing instruction with regards to testing. Second, Vice-Chair Collins is uncomfortable with a goal that says only a percentage of economically disadvantaged kindergarten students will be successful by eighth grade. He is looking for understanding on how we achieve and exceed these goals. Vice-Chair Collins noted the initial feedback Alabama received on three course testing.
- Dr. Oxendine agrees with Vice-Chair Collins comments. She is startled that after No Child Left Behind and Race to the Top, only 31.6% of American Indian students are at proficient in North Carolina.
- Dr. Howard thanked the board for their feedback and noted that these outputs should raise awareness, but the inputs occurring at our schools every day are what make the difference.
- Dr. Howard moved on to interim progress and long-term goals for English learner's progress. She described the measure as progress and performance on English language proficiency tests, and the number of students who meet exit criteria. Dr. Howard described the data as stemming from 2015-2016 WIDA Access 2.0 assessment. The achievement standards for this assessment have changed in the last few years. The percent of students now meeting the exit criteria is dropping significantly. We are in the process of looking at 2016-2017 data, and expect exit rates to change significantly.
- Dr. Howard provided a reminder about the grade 8 math exception, and noted the need for a potential waiver from the USED for grade 7.
- She also noted the N size impacts on the percent of schools included. Dr. Howard noted that this is a decision point for the plan. 30 is the ceiling of what will be approved, but other state are going lower. A lower N size allows more schools to be included in the accountability model.
- Dr. Howard explained 95% participation. If a school does not meet 95% participation, the difference will be added to the denominator.
- Dr. Howard shared that we have been reporting academically gifted students and these will be reported as a subgroup on the NC Report Cards.

- Dr. Howard reflected that there have been discussions about translated assessments – at this time, North Carolina has no intention to do so. State law requires all instruction to be delivered in English. Our conclusion is that we must provide assessments in English as well. Other states are providing similar responses.
- She noted that students with severe cognitive disabilities are not given an alternative diploma in NC. Feedback from stakeholders was to not provide an alternative diploma at this time.
- Wayne McDevitt asked about the minimum N size. He has heard that other states have a very different number than ours. Dr. Howard confirmed that our N size is 30, and that if you do not have 30 students in a subgroup category you will not have report on the long-term goals or the measure under the accountability model if you do not meet the N size. According to Dr. Howard, other states range from 10-20. She is unaware if any states have higher.
- Dr. Barbour began her presentation on CSI and TSI. She explained that CSI standards for comprehensive support and improvement. CSI schools are in the bottom 5% based on the achievement score, or have a graduation rate of less than 66.7%. A CSI school has needs across the board. Dr. Barbour explained that CSI schools will first be identified in 2018-2019 because a year of data is necessary to identify the schools. For the 2018-2019 year, we will request a waiver from USED to continue to identify and serve priority schools identified during the 2017-2018 school year. A similar rule applies for the graduation threshold. According to Dr. Barbour, data will be collected at the end of the 2017-2018 school year.
- Dr. Oxendine asked whether “lowest performing high schools” applies to Title I high schools, or all high schools. Dr. Barbour clarified that it applies to all high schools. Dr. Oxendine asked if all TSI schools are CSI schools – Dr. Barbour explained they are not, and that it is not automatic.
- Mr. Gregory Alcorn asked what resources are available for this work. Dr. Barbour noted that there are Title I dollars that come with our ESSA plan that we can determine how to use and support these CSI schools.
- Mr. Eric Davis asked whether these definitions for CSI and TSI were given to us or whether we have selected these definitions. Dr. Barbour noted that it is a combination of both. There are minimums that must be met, however, our current definitions were developed by DST, Federal Programs and the Accountability Division. Mr. Davis asked what the alternative definitions were? Dr. Barbour noted that she did not have any to provide, however, they are happy to make changes based on suggestions.
- Dr. Oxendine suggested that if there was an opportunity to change definitions, perhaps we could talk more about CSI not matching TSI.
- Dr. Barbour noted that CSI schools are identified every three years. This is important because of the time it takes to implement strategies and programs.
- Dr. Barbour transitioned to TSI, and noted the complicated nature of TSI. She referred to the last supplemental attachment on page 169 and noted that it is a wonderful longitudinal document projecting out TSI and CSI definitions. TSI schools have consistently underperforming subgroups. Since consistently is defined as “over time,” we must have sufficient data, and therefore, the first group of schools will be identified in 2019-2020. Three years of data will be necessary to identify a school that has a pattern of consistent underperformance by subgroup. TSI also includes additional support not exiting – meaning long-range subgroup performance and subgroups that continue to not meet the mark. A TSI school can become a CSI if there are long-range performance issue among a given subgroup.
- Dr. Oxendine noted that if we intend to meet our long-term goals, we need to be intervening sooner. Dr. Barbour explained that a school that reaches interim goals may exit TSI. Intervention is dependent upon the work that comes beyond this plan. A collaborative effort is needed for these schools across the Department.
- Looking at the chart of interim progress and long-term goals, Mr. Davis asked if we haven’t already identified our low performing subgroups? Dr. Barbour agreed that we have. Mr. Davis then asked why we

had to wait several years to identify the groups. Dr. Barbour noted that it is a different model and score than previously utilized. Dr. Barbour clarified that it is not a break in service, and that we are continuing to serve schools under the current definition while we transition to a new definition.

- Amy White asked about the advantage and disadvantage of CSI and TSI. Would the state have to realign its budget to support these schools or would the federal government set aside money to support these schools? Dr. Barbour noted that there is money set aside in the federal budget. She reiterated that the schools DST currently serves are low performing based on our state definition. There are not additional state dollars, but federal dollars will help in the support of CSI and TSI schools.
- Wayne McDevitt noted the initiative to address the achievement gap, and noted an opportunity to look at underperforming subgroups and targeting accordingly. Dr. Barbour noted that this is where the collaborative nature of the work in standards, assessments and DST is beneficial. The three can come together to address these issues including understanding individual learners and understanding individualized learning. This is also where professional development support comes in.
- Amanda Bell asked whether DST has received a waiver to serve the subgroups now? Dr. Barbour clarified that we have not applied for the waiver yet, but that it will allow us to continue to serve the previously and currently identified groups of priority and focus schools (these are similar to CSI, but not the same). DST currently serves a population of priority and focus schools, plus NC identified low performing schools. Amanda Bell asked if the subgroups are effectively the same? Dr. Barbour agreed that subgroups are consistent across the schools, and DST can target professional development to under performing groups as needed. Amanda Bell further asked what different services will be provided to the subgroups? Dr. Barbour clarified that they will continue to look at successful past practices and promising programs, however, services are customized based on individual schools. These services have been provided for years, but only to a limited number of schools.
- Dr. Barbour emphasized the more rigorous interventions that Eric Hall will present on later.
- Dr. Oxendine requested a one-pager that lists categories of schools that receive various types of support. In addition, the types of interventions that take place.
- Dr. Howard concluded by linking together the indicators from the accountability model, which are used to identify CSI and TSI schools. However, she noted that long-term goals are separate. These goals look at all students and subgroup performance. The state is asked how the long-term goals connect to the accountability model. If long-term goals are reached over time, you would see improved outcomes from the accountability model.
- No additional comments were made.

This item is presented for Discussion during the July 2017 State Board of Education meeting. (See Attachment SLA 5)

ADJOURNMENT

Indicating no other business, SLA Committee Chair Eric Davis adjourned the July 2017 SLA Committee meeting.

EDUCATION INNOVATION AND CHARTER SCHOOLS COMMITTEE CHAIR REPORT
(Ms. Rebecca Taylor, Chair, Mr. Wayne McDevitt, Vice Chair)

ACTION

EICS 1 – Restart Applications for the Restart Model

SBE Strategic Plan:

Goal 1: Every student has a personalized education

Goal 1: Every student in the NC Public School System graduates from high school prepared for work, further education, and citizenship.

Objective 1.1: Increase the cohort graduation rate.

Objective 1.2: Graduate students prepared for post-secondary education.

Objective 1.3: Graduate students pursuing a Career and Technical Education (CTE) concentration prepared for careers.

Objective 1.4: Reduce the percentage of students needing remediation in post-secondary education.

Objective 1.5: Increase student performance on the state's End-of-Grade (EOG) and End-of-Course (EOC) Assessments and on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).

Presenter(s): Dr. Nancy Barbour (Director, District and School Transformation)

Description:

Recurring Low Performing Schools have the opportunity to apply for one of four Reform Models to utilize innovative school reform and reverse a history of low performance. The Department has received a number of Reform Model applications from across the state listed by LEA below. These applications are posted and have been read and reviewed, and are being presented for approval at the July State Board Meeting. Applications Submitted for Approval: 21 Reform Model Applications are being submitted for approval. The following list includes the name of the school district and school.

Durham Public Schools

1. Bethesda Elementary
2. Brogden Middle
3. Eno Valley Elementary
4. Glenn Elementary
5. Shepard Middle
6. Lakewood Elementary
7. Fayetteville Street Elementary
8. Lowe's Grove Middle
9. Lucas Middle
10. E.K. Powe Elementary
11. Githens Middle
12. Southern School of Energy and Sustainability
13. Sandy Ridge Elementary
14. Y.E. Smith Elementary

Onslow County Schools

1. Clyde Erwin Elementary
2. Richlands Elementary

Washington County Schools

1. Creswell High
2. Pines Elementary

Union County Schools

1. Monroe Middle
2. East Union Middle

Kannapolis City Schools

1. Fred Wilson Elementary

Recommendations:

It is recommended that the State Board approve these applications.

Discussion/Comments:

- EICS Committee Chair Rebecca Taylor reminded the SBE that Dr. Nancy Barbour presented 21 restart applications at the June meeting.

Upon motion by Ms. Rebecca Taylor and seconded by Vice-Chair Collins, the Board voted unanimously to approve the Restart Applications for the Restart Reform Model, as presented. (See attachment EICS 1)

ACTION ON FIRST READING

EICS 2 – Ready-to-Open Recommendations for Schools Opening in 2017

Policy Implications: 115C-218.5; SBE# CHTR-013

SBE Strategic Plan:

Goal 1: Every student has a personalized education

Objective 4: Increase the number of charter schools meeting academic, operational, and financial goals

Presenter(s): Mr. Dave Machado (Director, Office of Charter Schools), Dr. Kebbler Williams (Education Consultant, Office of Charter Schools), and Mr. Alex Quigley (Chair, Charter Schools Advisory Board)

Description:

Consistent with §115C-218.5 and CHTR-013, the State Board of Education (SBE) grants initial approval to applicants for charters “contingent upon the completion of a planning year program.” This means that each nonprofit board approved for a charter must participate in an SBE-adopted planning program, known as “Ready to Open” (RTO) prior to opening the charter school to serve students.

Each initially approved charter school works with the Office of Charter Schools (OCS) to submit a final RTO progress report to the Charter School Advisory Board (CSAB) ten to twelve weeks prior to the start of the school’s first operational year. The CSAB uses this report as the basis for determining whether to recommend that the SBE approve the school to open as planned.

The RTO Progress Report provides a framework to help an initially approved charter school’s lead administrator and board develop required plans and procedures for the school. The framework also serves as a marketing tool

that the school can use to demonstrate its readiness to prospective students, parents, and the community. If a school is unable to meet the RTO standards or requirements stipulated in the charter agreement, the opening of the school could be postponed by one year or, if the circumstances are serious enough, the charter could be revoked under § 115C-218.95.

On May 26, 2017, board members from the seven charter schools scheduled to open in 2017 submitted final RTO Progress Report, which was then reviewed by OCS and the NCDPI Exceptional Children (EC) Division. The evaluators rated each section of the RTO Progress Report and provided feedback where needed.

Based on that evaluation, six of the seven schools were required to appear before the CSAB on June 13, 2017, because they were rated “insufficient” in one area or because they needed to address an SBE delay stipulation previously placed upon them (attached to this executive summary is a document that provides more detail about these schools). Board members from each school were invited to appear before the CSAB to answer questions concerning the identified deficiencies or stipulations. At the end of the discussion regarding each of the six schools, the CSAB voted on whether to recommend each of those six and the other remaining school to the SBE as “approved to continue their progression towards opening in 2017.”

The CSAB disposition for each of the seven schools scheduled to open in 2017 is as follows:

School (County)	Recommendation (Vote)
1. Coastal Preparatory Academy: A Challenge Foundation Academy ² (New Hanover County)	Approved (Unanimous; 2 Abstentions)
2. Emereau: Bladen (Bladen County)	Approved (Unanimous)
3. Movement School (Mecklenburg County)	Approved (Unanimous)
4. Peak Charter Academy ¹ (Wake County)	Approved (Unanimous)
5. Pine Springs Preparatory Academy: A Challenge Foundation Academy ² (Wake County)	Approved (Unanimous; 2 Abstentions)
6. Unity Classical Charter School: A Challenge Foundation Academy ² (Mecklenburg County)	Approved (Unanimous; 2 Abstentions)
7. UpROAR Leadership Academy (Mecklenburg County)	Approved (Unanimous)

Notes:

Education Management Organization/Charter Management Organization

1 = National Heritage Academies

2 = TeamCFA

Charter Schools Advisory Board (CSAB) Members

Kevin Wilkinson and Hilda Parlér were absent from the meeting. Tony Helton and Joe Maimone abstained from the vote on the TeamCFA schools.

Next Steps

Each school approved by the SBE will continue its work toward opening between August 1 and September 5, 2017. OCS will provide additional feedback to the schools in late July based on items that the boards of each school will resubmit to show progress since their May 26 submission.

Recommendations:

The NC Charter School Advisory Board recommends that the State Board of Education accept its recommendations for the schools scheduled to open in 2017.

Discussion/Comments:

- EICS Committee Chair Rebecca Taylor recognized Alex Quigley to present this item.
- While waiting for Alex Quigley to arrive in the board room, Ms. Taylor gave a quick overview of EICS 2. This item deals with the ready to open recommendations for the schools opening in 2017. According to Ms. Taylor, Quigley will provide an overview of where the schools are in the process and an overview of the interviews. While there were 14 schools in total, and we are now down to seven.
- No additional comments were made.

This item is presented for Action on First Reading during the July 2017 State Board of Education meeting. (See Attachment EICS 2)

Upon motion by Ms. Rebecca Taylor and seconded by Mr. Wayne McDevitt, the Board voted unanimously to approve the Ready-to-Open Recommendations for Schools Opening in 2017, as presented. (See attachment EICS 2)

ACTION ON FIRST READING

EICS 3 – Request for Decreased Initial Allotment by Unity Classical School: A Challenge Foundation

Academy

Policy Implications:

SBE Strategic Plan:

Goal 1: Every student has a personalized education

Objective 4: Increase the number of charter schools meeting academic, operational, and financial goals

Presenter(s): Mr. Dave Machado (Director, Office of Charter Schools), Dr. Kebbler Williams (Education Consultant, Office of Charter Schools)

Description:

Unity Classical Charter School: A Challenge Foundation Academy (UCCS:CFA) has requested in writing (attached) that the State Board of Education (SBE) base the school's initial funding allotment for the 2017-18 school year on an average daily membership (ADM) of 138, rather than the maximum of 207 indicated in the school's approved charter. The school submitted this request after submitting its May Ready to Open Report and realizing how far it was below the standard for enrollment, which is at least 75% of projected enrollment by June

1st. As of June 2nd, UCCS-CFA had enrolled only 85 students, which was 41% of its projected enrollment. By June 12th, that number had risen to 92 students (44%).

In light of UCCS-CFA's written request, the Department of Public Instruction will fund the school's initial allotment based on an ADM of 138. In keeping with SBE policy, for subsequent allotments during the 2016-17 school year, the Department will then base the allotment on actual ADM, as determined through standard data collection procedures, up to the maximum of 138 students.

Recommendations:

The Office of Charter Schools recommends that the State Board of Education approve this allotment reduction for Unity Classical Charter School: A Challenge Foundation Academy.

Discussion/Comments:

- EICS Committee Chair Rebecca Taylor recognized Alex Quigley to present this item.
- Alex Quigley stated that a downward adjustment of a projection shows discipline about the reality of what it is like to begin the enrollment process and that this adjustment makes sense for approval.
- Chairman Cobey stated that this is a responsible thing to do and appreciates the item.
- No additional comments were made.

This item is presented for Action on First Reading during the July 2017 State Board of Education meeting. (See Attachment EICS 3)

Upon motion by Ms. Rebecca Taylor and seconded by Mr. Gregory Alcorn, the Board voted unanimously to accept the Request for Decreased Initial Allotment by Unity Classical School: A Challenge Foundation Academy, as presented. (See attachment EICS 3)

ACTION ON FIRST READING

EICS 4 – Stipulation Recommendation for Heritage Collegiate Leadership Academy

Policy Implications: G.S. 115C-218.30

SBE Strategic Plan:

Goal 1: Every student has a personalized education

Objective 4: Increase the number of charter schools meeting academic, operational, and financial goals

Presenter(s): Mr. Dave Machado (Director, Office of Charter Schools), Ms. Cande Wood (Consultant, Office of Charter Schools Advisory Board)

Description:

Heritage Collegiate Leadership Academy (located in Bertie County) currently serves students in Kindergarten through fifth grade. The school plans to expand to grade six in the 2017-18 school year. Since opening for operation in 2014, the school has struggled with meeting academic, operational and financial requirements. For example, Heritage Collegiate Leadership Academy (HCLA) was the only school that failed to comply with the Performance Framework reporting requirements in 2015-16. Additionally, the annual audit (required by GS. 115C-218 to be submitted by October 31) was not received until April 2017. HCLA was the only charter school submitted its audit so late after the October 31 deadline without an approved extension.

Representatives of the school met with the Charter School Advisory Board (CSAB) in May and June 2017 to discuss the systemic non-compliance issues. At its June 13, 2017, meeting, the CSAB made the following recommendations for consideration by the State Board of Education (SBE) regarding Heritage Collegiate Leadership Academy (HCLA) and recommends initiating revocation immediately should any of the stipulations not be met:

1. Per GS 115C-218.30 and Section 10 of the Charter Agreement, HCLA is reminded that it is required to submit required reports. Failure to submit such reports may be grounds for revocation of the Charter. Specifically, any and all required reporting must be completed and submitted on time. This includes, but is not limited to the SBE, CSAB, State, North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI), Office of Charter schools (OCS), and Financial Business Services (FBS) reporting. The school is required to submit its audit by the October 31 deadline outlined in GS. 115C.218 and provide OCS with monthly financial statements.
2. As of June 14, 2017, Heritage Collegiate Leadership is placed on Governance Noncompliance Status. Per SBE Policy CHTR-006, when in Noncompliance Status, the school is expected to immediately address all of the exceptions that caused the governance warnings. State funds for the school will be allotted on a monthly basis until the exceptions that caused all of the governance warnings are corrected.
3. HCLA's first initial allotment for 2017-18 shall be equivalent to the last day of the 2016-17 school year. This stipulation does not preclude the school from enrolling up to its maximum enrollment allowed by GS 115C-218 and SBE policy. Allotments will be adjusted accordingly after the first initial allotment.
4. HCLA must add new board members to comply with the minimum of five (5) voting members. The nonprofit is required to maintain a minimum of five (5) board members. In the alternative, the current board may be dissolved and a new board created. HCLA shall comply with this requirement and report to OCS by July 31, 2017.
5. HCLA shall provide OCS with monthly detailed board meeting minutes which accurately reflect each meeting, discussions, member voting, and board actions.
6. HCLA is required to attend two (2) CSAB meetings (one in the fall of 2017 and, in addition, the December 2017 regularly scheduled meeting).
7. HCLA is required to attend all mandatory NCDPI/OCS training.
8. HCLA shall cooperate with OCS and OCS will conduct two (2) unannounced site visits before the regularly scheduled December 2017 CSAB meeting.
9. HCLA shall work with OCS and FBS to reconcile the payroll discrepancies outlined in previously submitted documentation.
10. HCLA shall provide a nepotism report to OCS on or before 5:00 p.m. Friday, June 16, 2017, which details the position and respective familial relationships (regardless of the Federal definition). This should include all employees, board members, contractors, and vendors of the school.

The above stipulations do not remove HCLA's obligations to fulfill all other terms and requirements outlined in the charter agreement as well as comply with state and federal laws. Further, the SBE/CSAB, in requiring HCLA's fulfillment of the stipulations, reserves the right to recommend additional action/requirements including initiating revocation of the charter, as needed or warranted.

Recommendations:

The Charter Schools Advisory Board (CSAB) recommends that the State Board of Education accept its recommended stipulations regarding Heritage Collegiate Leadership Academy (HCLA).

Discussion/Comments:

- EICS Committee Chair Rebecca Taylor recognized Alex Quigley to present this item.
- Mr. Quigley introduced the recommendation to place stipulations on Heritage Collegiate Leadership Academy. He informed the SBE that there are a host of issues with this school including failure to submit virtually anything of significance on time including their performance framework and audit. Mr. Quigley mentioned issues with their nepotism policy and other compliance problems. He stated that revocation was considered, but CSAB preferred to allow the school time to correct those issues. CSAB has outlined a series of stipulations. Mr. Quigley noted that an important stipulation is that HCLA will be funded based on current annual enrollment as opposed to their projected enrollment.
- Ms. Taylor asked if they are currently losing students? Mr. Quigley replied that they have not seen a total loss of students. HCLA had argued enrollment would increase based on expansion to other districts, however Mr. Quigley stated that CSAB does not have confidence in that projection given current management.
- Ms. Taylor noted her appreciation for the stipulations CSAB came up with.
- No additional comments were made.

Upon motion by Ms. Rebecca Taylor and seconded by Mr. Wayne McDevitt, the Board voted unanimously to approve the Stipulation Recommendation for Heritage Collegiate Leadership Academy as presented. (See attachment EICS 4)

This item is presented for Action on First Reading during the July 2017 State Board of Education meeting. (See Attachment EICS 4)

EICS 11 – Approval of State Board of Education Appointee to the Charter Schools Advisor Board

Policy Implications: G.S. 115C-218

SBE Strategic Plan:

Goal 1: Every student has a personalized education

Objective 4: Increase the number of charter schools meeting academic, operational, and financial goals

Presenter(s): Mr. Dave Machado (Director, Office of Charter Schools), Ms. Becky Taylor (Chair, Education, Innovation, and Charter Schools, State Board of Education)

Description:

Session law 2016-126 (HB 17), Section 17(b) (1-11) changed the membership and appointments for the Charter Schools Advisory Board (CSAB). Specifically, the House, Senate, Lt. Governor or his designee and the State Board of Education (SBE) appoint the eleven voting CSAB members. Additionally, the Superintendent receives a non-voting position, as Secretary for the CSAB. The chart below details the respective CSAB voting and non-voting membership.

Seven CSAB members' terms expired June 30, 2017. Upon the term expiration, appropriate nominations/appointments were assigned by the House, Senate and Lt. Governor (HB 256/SL 2017-75). The SBE must now fill its vacant position as directed by S.L. 2016-126. Specifically, the State Board of Education must appoint one member to the Charter School Advisory Board who is not a current member of the State Board of Education and who is a charter school advocate in North Carolina.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that the SBE approve Mr. Alex Quigley to serve as a non-State Board of Education appointee to the Charter Schools Advisory Board. Mr. Quigley has served on the CSAB as Chairman during the last three years and has operated/managed charter schools in and outside North Carolina.

Discussion/Comments:

- EICS Committee Chair Rebecca Taylor explained this item as an approval of the SBE appointee to the CSAB. The eBoard executive summary notes that 7 members expired June 30, 2017. She stated that SBE must fill its vacant position with an individual who is not a member of the SBE and who is a charter school advocate in North Carolina. She recognized Mr. Quigley who has served as Chairman for the last three years, and he has also operated and managed charter school in and outside of North Carolina.
- Chairman Cobey noted that the other SBE representative Ms. Turner's term has not yet expired.
- Mr. McDevitt asked if Mr. Quigley was willing to serve? Ms. Taylor jokingly noted that we're not asking him. Chairman Cobey noted he understood Mr. Quigley was willing to serve.
- No additional comments were made.

Upon motion by Ms. Rebecca Taylor and seconded by Mr. Wayne McDevitt, the Board voted unanimously to approve the Stipulation Recommendation for Heritage Collegiate Leadership Academy as presented. (See attachment EICS 4) – This should reflect the motion to approve Mr. Alex Quigley to the Charter Schools Advisory Board.

This item is presented for Action on First Reading during the July 2017 State Board of Education meeting. (See Attachment EICS 4)

DISCUSSION

EICS 5 – Recommended Changes to Charter School Finance and Governance Noncompliance Policy (CHTR-006)

Policy Implications: SBE# CHTR-006

SBE Strategic Plan:

Goal 1: Every student has a personalized education

Objective 4: Increase the number of charter schools meeting academic, operational, and financial goals

Presenter(s): Mr. Dave Machado (Director, Office of Charter Schools), Ms. Cande Wood (Consultant, Office of Charter Schools), Mr. Alex Quigley (Chair, Charter Schools Advisory Board)

Description:

Per a recommendation and input from the Office of Charter Schools (OCS), the Charter Schools Advisory Board (CSAB) recommends that the State Board of Education (SBE) amend CHTR-006 (Policy for Charter Schools on Financial and Governance Noncompliance) to reflect statutory changes and NCDPI processes. The CSAB met in May and June 2017 to discuss and ultimately approve the amended policy (attached).

The proposed policy changes provide extended flexibility in addressing charter school financial and governance noncompliance, remove the linear process and allow for noncompliance levels to be assigned based on severity.

Recommendations:

The Charter Schools Advisory Board recommends that the State Board of Education approve the policy.

Discussion/Comments:

- EICS Committee Chair Rebecca Taylor recognized Deanna Townsend-Smith to present this item.
- Ms. Townsend-Smith noted that the CSAB has recommended changes to CHTR-006, which is the financial and governance non-compliance policy surrounding charter schools. This is the last policy to come before the SBE to bring everything in line with statutes and current procedures for places schools on financial and governance non-compliance. Ms. Townsend-Smith stated that the process has been streamlined and clarified. The CSAB did discuss and firmly recommended that the policy be approved.
- No additional comments were made.

This item is presented for Discussion during the July 2017 State Board of Education meeting. (See Attachment EICS 5)

DISCUSSION

EICS 6– Recommendation for Monroe Charter School Application

Policy Implications:

SBE Strategic Plan:

Goal 1: Every student has a personalized education

Objective 4: Increase the number of charter schools meeting academic, operational, and financial goals

Presenter(s): Mr. Dave Machado (Director, Office of Charter Schools), Dr. Deanna Townsend-Smith (Assistant Director, Office of Charter Schools), Mr. Alex Quigley (Chair, Charter Schools Advisory Board), and Mr. Steven Walker (Vice Chair, Charter Schools Advisory Board)

Description:

The State Board of Education (SBE) annually adopts a process and timeline by which the NCDPI Office of Charter Schools manages the solicitation and review of applications to operate a charter school in NC. At the end of this process, the SBE receives recommendations from the NC Charter Schools Advisory Board (CSAB) regarding which applications for charters should be approved. This year's recommendations from the CSAB are for schools that would open for the 2018-19 school year.

On September 19, 2016 (deadline extended due to technical difficulties), thirty-eight (38) applicants submitted applications ahead of the 5:00 PM (EST) deadline. The Office of Charter Schools reviewed all thirty-eight (38) of those applications to ensure that they were complete. Seventeen (17) applications were certified to be incomplete. Consistent with the State Board-approved application timeline and process and per statute, any applicant group whose application was deemed incomplete was then granted five (5) business days to submit any missing information. At the end of this "second chance" process, fourteen (14) of the seventeen (17) incomplete applications were deemed complete. Three (3) of the applications deemed incomplete initially, submitted information to complete their application at a later time during the process.

From September through December 2016, external evaluators possessing multiple years of experience in the areas of finance, governance, operations, and academics, read the thirty-eight (38) submitted applications and provided feedback on them through a standard rubric to inform the CSAB's review and decision-making. All thirty-eight (38) applications (along with clarification documents, where applicable) were forwarded to the CSAB Policy and Performance committees for review. Thirty-eight (38) applicant groups were provided an in-person clarification opportunity in front of the CSAB committees regarding any item in the application that the external reviewers deemed to be less than clear. Following the in-person clarification opportunity, the CSAB committee discussed and made a recommendation to the full CSAB on which applicant groups would receive a one-hour interview opportunity with the full CSAB.

The CSAB invited twenty-four (24) of thirty-eight (38) applicant groups to be interviewed by the full CSAB. Each applicant group was provided the opportunity to respond to questions posed by the CSAB concerning deficiencies and clarification from the submitted application. At the end of the one-hour deliberations regarding each applicant group, the CSAB voted whether to recommend the group to the SBE as ready to enter the Planning Year. The CSAB met on November 15, 2016; December 8-9, 2016, January 9 -11, 2017, February 6-7, 2017, March 6, 2017 and April 10-11, 2017; and, consistent with the SBE-approved timeline, finalized all application recommendations in time to submit the recommendations below to the SBE in May 2017.

At its regularly scheduled May 2017 meeting, the SBE approved 14 of 15 charter school application recommendations from the CSAB. The SBE withheld approval for Monroe Charter Academy and sent the application back to the CSAB for further discussion/consideration (per CHTR-012) since the nonprofit group has the same board members as the Anson Charter Academy nonprofit board of directors. The OCS presented a report (attached) for SBE and CSAB consideration to facilitate discussions.

The CSAB met at its regularly scheduled June 13, 2017, meeting, to discuss and reconsider the Monroe Charter Academy application. After hearing from members of the Monroe Charter Academy board, reviewing the aforementioned report, the CSAB voted (7 – 3; TS, CT, ES dissenting; HP absent) to recommend that the State Board of Education (SBE) grant Monroe Charter Academy a charter, subject to the completion of a planning year.

Charter Schools Advisory Board (CSAB) Members

AQ = Alex Quigley
 SW = Steven Walker
 JM = Joseph Maimone
 CT = Cheryl Turner
 SR = Sherry Reeves
 TH = Tony Helton
 AH = Alan Hawkes
 PG = Phyllis Gibbs
 ES = Eric Sanchez
 HP = Hilda Parlér
 TS = Tammi Sutton

The completed application rubric and impact statement(s) for each school are located on the following Office of Charter School webpage: <http://www.dpi.state.nc.us/charterschools/applications/submitted/2018-19/>.

Each applicant approved by the SBE will begin a Planning Year program that includes detailed training from appropriate staff within the Department of Public Instruction regarding how to operate a charter school successfully in NC. Per SBE Policy CHTR-013, “final approval of the charter will be contingent upon successfully completing the planning program requirements.” The SBE will revisit the charter approval as the end of the Planning Year approaches to determine if the school has met the requirements to be considered “Ready to Open.”

Recommendations:

The NC Charter Schools Advisory Board recommends that the State Board of Education accept its recommendations for Monroe Charter Academy to open in 2018-19 contingent upon the successful completion of the Planning Year requirements.

Discussion/Comments:

- EICS Committee Chair Rebecca Taylor recognized Alex Quigley to present this item.
- Ms. Taylor noted that this was an application that was returned to CSAB in June. Two applications were received – one for Anson and the other for Monroe. Anson was approved but CSAB was requested to review Monroe further.
- Mr. Quigley thanked the SBE for his reappointment to the CSAB.
- Mr. Quigley noted that CSAB explored the structure of the two schools, the capacity to open two schools at the same time, and the impact of location and proximity of the schools. According to Mr. Quigley, CSAB basically conducted a second interview. CSAB also looked, and found, precedent for approving multiple schools in the same year. It was not a unanimous decision by CSAB, but Mr. Quigley was in the majority and represents the views of the majority in this decision. Mr. Quigley also highlighted the Ready to Open process, which provides opportunity for any issues to be addressed.
- Wayne McDevitt asked whether guidance would be developed for multiple applications from a single board. Mr. Quigley noted that the CSAB has discussed taking up a policy to that effect next fall. At the same time, flexibility is valuable in advising the SBE. Mr. McDevitt noted that it is important to carefully watch the progress made during the coming year with both schools – and that resource issues that may come into play.
- Ms. Taylor noted that the SBE must make a decision by August 15th.
- Steven Walker noted that one member was absent the day of the vote, but would have voted in favor, making the vote 8-3. As far as the process goes, the statutory guideline is August 15th, but this school is unique in waiting for approval this late in the year.
- Vice-Chair Collins requested that the item be moved to Action on First Reading.
- Ms. Taylor asked if there was a sense of urgency. Mr. Walker noted his understanding that the lack of approval is slowing down the development of the school in Monroe. He said they intended to add more members of the board from Monroe, but individuals may be unwilling to serve given the ambiguity.
- Ms. Taylor noted that she was not opposed to moving to action on first reading.
- Mr. Gregory Alcorn asked about the relationship between charter school board member Mr. Goodall and the consulting firm that is running the school. Mr. Quigley noted that it is only a consulting relationship. The firm is not managing the charter school and Mr. Goodall will be resigning from the board.
- No additional comments were made.

This item was moved to for Action on First Reading during the July 2017 State Board of Education meeting. (See Attachment EICS 6)

Upon motion by Vice-Chair Collins and seconded by Ms. Rebecca Taylor, the Board voted unanimously to approve the Monroe Charter School Application as presented. (See attachment EICS 6)

DISCUSSION
EICS 7– Restart Applications for the Restart Reform Model
Policy Implications:

- SBE Strategic Plan:**
- Goal 1:** Every student in the NC Public School System graduates from high school prepared for work, further education, and citizenship.
 - Objective 1.1:** Increase the cohort graduation rate.
 - Objective 1.2:** Graduate students prepared for post-secondary education.
 - Objective 1.3:** Graduate students pursuing a Career and Technical Education (CTE) concentration prepared for careers.
 - Objective 1.4:** Reduce the percentage of students needing remediation in post-secondary education.
 - Objective 1.5:** Increase student performance on the state’s End-of-Grade (EOG) and End-of-Course (EOC) Assessments and on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).

Presenter(s): Dr. Nancy Barbour (Director, District and School Transformation)

Description:
 Recurring Low Performing Schools have the opportunity to apply for one of four Reform Models to utilize innovative school reform and reverse a history of low performance. The Committee for Education Innovation and Charter Schools and the Department continue to receive a number of Reform Model applications from across the state. The most recent submitted applications are listed by LEA below. These applications are posted for review and will be processed by the Department, read, and reviewed, and potentially edited in preparation for their approval at the August State Board Meeting.

Applications Submitted for Approval: 2 Applications for the Restart Model are being submitted for discussion. The following list includes the name of the school district and school.

- Craven County Schools
1. Oaks Road Elementary School
 2. Roger Bell Elementary School

Recommendations:
 It is recommended that the State Board review and discuss these applications.

Discussion/Comments:

- EICS Committee Chair Ms. Rebecca Taylor recognized Dr. Nancy Barbour to present this item.
- Dr. Barbour presented two more applications for reform models. Both applications were from Craven County elementary schools.
- Ms. Taylor noted that she was excited to see the schools come forward. She referenced the recent visit by the Craven County Superintendent and staff. Ms. Taylor also mentioned the volume of reform model applications and the burden that must place on Dr. Barbour’s staff. She asked if it was time to look at a timeline for acceptance of recommendations and approvals so it is not a revolving door. Dr. Barbour

welcomed the opportunity to look at that subject further, as well as the creative methods the schools are using with their reform models. Dr. Barbour suggested putting together a group of external and internal stakeholders to look at the process and implications of charter-like flexibility, so they can provide good information to schools applying.

- Dr. Oxendine asked a whether the schools presented today might qualify as a CSI or TSI school. Dr. Barbour noted that he definition for applying for a reform model is recurring low-performing, which is two of three consecutive years.
- No additional comments were made.

This item is presented for Discussion during the July 2017 State Board of Education meeting. (See Attachment EICS 7)

DISCUSSION

EICS 8– Aristotle Charter School Request to Contract with AAC

Policy Implications:

SBE Strategic Plan:

Goal 1: Every student has a personalized education

Objective 4: Increase the number of charter schools meeting academic, operational, and financial goals

Presenter(s): Mr. Dave Machado (Director, Office of Charter Schools), Dr. Deanna Townsend-Smith (Assistant Director, Office of Charter School)

Description:

In 2013, the State Board of Education granted Aristotle Preparatory Academy a 10-year charter. The K-12 charter (currently K – 5) school located in Mecklenburg County is completing the third year of its charter term. The Aristotle Preparatory Academy Board has requested that the State Board of Education allow it to enter into a contract with a charter management company, Achievement for All Children (AAC), to assist with the operation of the charter school. According to policy CHTR-014, an amendment “employing or terminating a management company” requires State Board of Education (SBE) approval.

The AAC management company is newly formed and has not established a track record as yet in North Carolina or elsewhere. A number of questions have arisen concerning the structure and governance of the management company in addition to its capacity to serve the Aristotle Preparatory Academy Board in the successful operation of the charter school.

Recommendations:

It is requested that a subcommittee of the State Board of Education review and recommend appropriate action with respect to Aristotle Preparatory Academy’s amendment request at its August 2017 meeting.

Discussion/Comments:

- EICS Committee Chair Rebecca Taylor noted that Aristotle Preparatory Academy has submitted a request for a partnership with a newly formed charter school management organization. There have been several questions about the new organization concerning its structure and governance. Ms. Taylor stated that a

subcommittee is necessary to bring a recommendation to the SBE for action. Ms. Taylor requested the Chairman appoint a subcommittee.

- Chairman Cobey appointed a subcommittee consisting of Vice-Chair Collins, Ms. Taylor and Ms. White.
- No additional comments were made.

This item is presented for Discussion during the July 2017 State Board of Education meeting. (See Attachment EICS 8)

INFORMATION

EICS 9– Launch of the North Carolina Achievement School District (Innovative School District)

Policy Implications:

Presenter(s): Dr. Eric Hall, NC Achievement School District Superintendent

Description:

Superintendent Eric Hall will provide an overview and introduction to the law that establishes the NC Achievement School District/Innovative School District and the implementation strategy that is currently under development for the 2017-18 and 2018-19 school years. In this presentation, the Superintendent will discuss the emerging mission and vision for the district, as well as steps that will be taken to design innovative partnerships with parents and local communities, with the primary goal being improved student achievement.

Recommendations:

None at this time.

Discussion/Comments:

- EICS Committee Chair Rebecca Taylor recognized Dr. Eric Hall to present this item.
- Ms. Taylor introduced Dr. Hall and indicated that Dr. Hall would provide an overview, introduction to the law, and share regarding the implementation strategies that have already started.
- Chairman Cobey noted that the General Assembly has changed the name of the Achievement School District.
- Dr. Hall thanked the SBE for the opportunity to serve in this capacity. Dr. Hall highlighted the fact that the name and the work has started to evolve. He noted that in developing the district the General Assembly originally looked to other states like Tennessee and Louisiana, but we now have an opportunity to re-define what the district means in North Carolina. Dr. Hall asked how we create opportunities to partner in ways that maybe we haven't partnered in the past. Dr. Hall introduced the North Carolina Innovative School District brand, which is centered on a few core values including partnership. However, it's a partnership with a balance of accountability. Dr. Hall highlighted the logo for the Innovative School District which emphasizes partnerships with local communities and students. He also introduced the draft mission of the Innovative School District: creating innovative conditions in local communities to help promote equity and opportunities for the students that we serve, while pushing for high expectations for student achievement. He emphasized the need to partner with local schools. Dr. Hall gave a brief description of the legislation including the Innovative School, which will be operated under contract by a charter management organization to operate the school for at least five years. Dr. Hall noted that he sees himself as a chief negotiator to find the right fit for the local school. The other component of the legislation is the Innovation Zone. With the Innovation Zone, a cluster of schools can be free of some of the rules and regulations that sometimes prevent them from being creative and innovative in their own space. Dr. Hall then discussed the six phases towards improved

achievement. The first phase is the consideration phase. By September, Dr. Hall intends to release the data that shows the list of qualifying schools. The list will include elementary schools that have a performance score in the lowest 5%. Dr. Hall noted that we must have both urban and rural schools. Dr. Hall went on to explain some additional factors that could impact consideration for a given year. Dr. Hall explained that the second phase is evaluation. He noted that this includes meetings with community and school representatives. He intends to gather context and greater understanding of existing programs, and barriers that the Innovative School District can help with. Dr. Hall anticipates the evaluation phase will take place between October and December. Dr. Hall explained that he will bring the schools before the SBE for approval before December 15th. In the selection phase, Dr. Hall will begin looking at potential CMO and EMO partners that could engage in work with us. There will be an application process and external evaluators. Once the schools are selected, by February 1st, the local school district must adopt a resolution that transfers the school to the Innovative School District, or to close the school. Dr. Hall said the next phase is the engagement phases, in which we will define contractual relationships before the next school year starts. This formalizes the partnership so that when we enter into this partnership phase we are married in this process together. An important part of this partnership is the Innovation Zone. According to Dr. Hall, the end here is the transition phase – how we transition the schools back to local control while taking care of students and parents. If we are producing great results, we want to see those results continue. He noted that if the local board of education does not want to receive the school back into the district, the CMO or EMO can apply to continue to operate that school as a charter school. He has seen it from a workforce lens as well. This is more than a couple of schools being transferred to operation under a CMO or EMO. Dr. Hall said that's why the mission statement is about creating conditions owned by the local community so that we are partner in the work, and working with people to find those solutions. Dr. Hall noted that a timeline is included in the SBE packet, and that the power point will be posted online on the Innovative School District website which was also being launched today. He stressed that this is a potential timeline. He explained that we owe it to communities to be open and transparent. We need to engage in deep dialogue and discussion about how we make good strong decisions in partnership with communities to drive strong results. Finally, Dr. Hall stated that we must have a commitment to research and to continue to learn. He noted that the General Assembly has funded an evaluation of this work. He said we need to pay attention to the data and change course as needed. As an Innovative District, we must learn from others who are doing ASD type work nationwide. We must also look at innovation in local communities that we can share with others across the state – creating a statewide network of partners.

- Chairman Cobey complemented Dr. Hall on the quality of his presentation. He commended Dr. Hall's work thus far.
- Mr. Reginald Kenan highlighted the importance of community. He noted that Dr. Hall seems prepared for the challenges of the role, and seems to believe in the work he's doing to support low performing schools. Mr. Kenan also emphasized the need to close the achievement gap.
- Wayne McDevitt thanked Dr. Hall for this presentation. He noted his appreciation for the name change. Mr. McDevitt shared his thoughts on the large number of innovative practices and programs we've created for public education, and the importance of scaling the most successful practices. He also requested Dr. Hall speak to this topic. Dr. Hall shared that ESSA will provide a framework for a continuum of support and improvement. ISD is one of the most rigorous interventions, but it is a new tool that supports flexibility and options.
- Amy White complemented Dr. Hall on being an innovative leader. In terms of leadership at the school level, Ms. White asked about the capacity to put the right leaders in place at these individual schools. Dr. Hall noted that school leadership counts, and the capacity and ability to innovate is important. Flexibility allows for innovative staffing models. He said that there will be disruption and there will be challenges, but we will

work to make good decisions while mitigating that as much as possible. He explained that we should use our resources in a coordinated way – including aligning partners in a creative way.

- Amanda Bell noted that some school administrators and teachers look at the innovative district in a negative way. She expressed her hope that Dr. Hall will quickly work with school boards so they can get a clearer understanding of what he is bringing to the district. Dr. Hall noted that he has reached out to the School Boards and Superintendent's Association, that he will continue to engage on the local level as well.
- Jason Griffin noted four reform models, and asked why as an elementary school principal he should select ISD over one of the other options. Dr. Hall noted that he would want to discuss and understand the needs of his particular school. He said that it's a matter of finding out the best solution for you, your school and your students, and fits within the local community.

This item is presented for Information during the July 2017 State Board of Education meeting. (See Attachment EICS 9)

ADJOURNMENT

Indicating no other business, EICS Committee Chair Rebecca Taylor adjourned the July 2017 EICS Committee meeting.

EDUCATOR STANDARDS AND PRACTICES COMMITTEE MEETING (Dr. Olivia Oxendine, Chair; Mr. Eric Davis, Vice Chair)

ES&P Committee Chair Olivia Oxendine called the July 2017 Educator Standards and Practices (ES&P) Committee meeting to order.

ACTION

ES&P 1 – Amendment to the Licensure Renewal Requirements Policy – LICN-005

Policy Implications: SBE# LICN-005

SBE Strategic Plan

Goal 3: Every student, every day has excellent educators

Objective 3.1: Develop and support highly effective teachers

Presenter(s): Dr. Maria Pitre-Martin (Deputy State Superintendent), Dr. Thomas R. Tomberlin (Director of Educator Human Capital Policy and Research), Ms. Susan Ruiz (Section Chief, Licensure)

Description:

NCDPI recommends changes to the General Requirements section of LICN-005. NCDPI recommends changing the number of required CEUs for teachers with expired licenses from fifteen to eight. For teachers who return to an initial license from a continuing license due to performance issues, the LEAs and charter schools will have discretion over the type of professional development the teacher needs to meet the state CEU requirement.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that the evaluation and licensure policy changes on the attached list be approved by the SBE.

Discussion/Comments:

- No comments were made.

Upon motion by Dr. Olivia Oxendine and seconded by Eric Davis, the Board voted unanimously to approve the Amendment to the Licensure Renewal Requirements Policy: Continuing Education Units (LICN-005), as presented. (See attachment ES&P 1)

This item is submitted for Action during the July 2017 State Board of Education meeting. (See Attachment ES&P 1)

ACTION ON FIRST READING

ES&P 2 – Educator Preparation Program Approvals for Institutions of Higher Education

Policy Implications: SBE# TCED-004

SBE Strategic Plan

Goal 3: Every student, every day has excellent educators

Objective 3.1: Develop and support highly effective teachers

Presenter(s): Dr. Maria Pitre-Martin (Deputy State Superintendent), Dr Robert Sox (Director, Educator Effectiveness), Dr. Andrew Sioberg (Service Support Coordinator, Education Preparation)

Description:

Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) are resubmitting all program descriptions and proposals for evaluation and review this semester. The Educator Preparation Program Approval Committee, with the assistance of DPI Information Technology programmers, launched a Web-based platform for the submission and review of current programs and new program proposals. These proposals are reviewed by trained public school practitioners, content experts, and/or higher education faculty. Extensive feedback is provided to the institution as necessary, and time is provided to make revisions before these are presented to the State Board for approval. Each program submission is reviewed for alignment with recent legislation and State Board policies, including use of a valid and reliable assessment of pedagogy (edTPA or PPAT), minimum sixteen-week student teaching and field experiences every semester in low-performing schools. A chart of reviewed and recommended programs is presented to the Board for approval.

Recommendation:

This item is presented for Action on First Reading at the July 2017 SBE meeting.

Discussion/Comments:

- ES&P Committee Chair Dr. Olivia Oxendine recognized the work done by Dr. Andrew Sioberg and Dr. Robert Sox along with our IHE review team to examine revisions in our education preparation programs.
- No additional comments were made.

Upon motion by Dr. Olivia Oxendine and seconded by Eric Davis, the Board voted unanimously to approve the Educator Preparation Program Approvals, as presented. (See attachment ES&P 2)

This item is submitted for Action on First Reading during the July 2017 State Board of Education meeting. (See Attachment ES&P 2)

DISCUSSION

ES&P 3 – Amendment to the Licensure Testing Requirements Policy – LICN-003

Policy Implications: SBE# LICN-003

SBE Strategic Plan

Goal 3: Every student, every day has excellent educators

Objective 3.1: Develop and support highly effective teachers

Presenter(s): Dr. Maria Pitre-Martin (Deputy State Superintendent), Dr. Robert Sox (Director, Educator Effectiveness), Dr. Andrew Sioberg (Service Support Coordinator, Educator Preparation), Ms. Susan Ruiz (Section Chief, Licensure)

Description:

The current policy (LICN-003) to exempt incoming students from having to take the Praxis Core tests needs to be updated as the SAT has been revised by College Board. Those changes altered how the test is scored and ultimately where the threshold should be set for exemption. The exemption threshold will impact all educator preparation programs in the state effective Summer 2017.

To provide clarity to the field regarding testing requirements, NCDPI recommends establishing June 30th as the end of the academic year.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that the North Carolina State Board of Education accepts these policy recommendations.

Discussion/Comments:

- ES&P Committee Chair Dr. Olivia Oxendine recognized Dr. Robert Sox to present this item.
- Dr. Sox noted that the purpose of this item is to address policy thresholds for students who take the SAT and thereby can exempt out of other license tests. DPI is proposing to adjust the threshold scores so they align with the new tests as it is set up by the college board. The changes to the current policy acknowledge the threshold from the previous test to carry through March 2016, and shifts the number for tests taken after March 2016. The updated policy will acknowledge the new format and the appropriate thresholds for students to be able to opt out of the license exams for math and for reading.
- Dr. Oxendine asked about feedback from the field and IHE partners. Dr. Sox noted that they were instrumental in making sure we were making the proper comparisons so that we were recommending reasonable equivalents. Dr. Oxendine asked whether IHEs are concerned about student's not taking a writing exam (since it's required for the Praxis). Dr. Sox noted that he is not as familiar with the breakouts of the praxis and the SAT, however, a part of the change is that separate tests under the SAT are now combined. Dr. Sox is not aware of any complaints by the IHEs
- Dr. Sioberg noted that the praxis does require a writing requirement, but that was note a concern raised by the IHE committee considering the change.
- No additional comments were made.

This item is submitted for Discussion during the July 2017 State Board of Education meeting. (See Attachment ES&P 3)

DISCUSSION

ES&P 4 – Amendment to the General Licensure Testing Requirements Policy – LICN-001

Policy Implications: SBE# LICN-001

SBE Strategic Plan

Goal 3: Every student, every day has excellent educators

Objective 3.1: Develop and support highly effective teachers

Presenter(s): Dr. Maria Pitre-Martin (Deputy State Superintendent), Dr. Thomas Tomberlin (Director of Educator Human Capital Policy and Research), Ms. Susan Ruiz (Section Chief, Licensure)

Description:

NCDPI recommends changes to Section 1.20 – Types of Licenses of policy LICN-001. Current SBE policy does not define how a teacher can re-enter the teaching profession if he/she fails to convert the initial license to a continuing license. NCDPI recommends that an individual be allowed to apply for an initial teaching license once all testing and/or coursework requirements have been met. NCDPI also recommends making August 15th the end of the academic year for testing purposes. NCDPI recommends defining the number of workdays (120) required to constitute a year of teaching. Additionally, NCDPI is making technical corrections to the policy that clearly establish testing time frames for all initially licensed teachers. A similar technical correction is made to policy LICN-003.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that the evaluation and licensure policy changes on the attached list be approved by the SBE.

Discussion/Comments:

- ES&P Committee Chair Dr. Olivia Oxendine recognized Dr. Tom Tomberlin to present this item.
- LICN-001 reflects recent changes to the statute around testing requirements for a teaching license in NC. There has been considerable confusion within the LEAs on how to meet the requirements for a continuing license. G.S.115C-296A requires a licensed teacher to hold a bachelor's degree and to achieve a minimum score on a standard examination. A candidate may have two years to meet these requirements.
- DPI has received questions on the term of the initial license, the deadline for completing licensure requirements, for whom testing requirements apply, and how to teachers return to teaching if they fail to meet requirements.
- Dr. Tomberlin noted that the new testing requirements were passed on August 4, 2016. For all teachers who submitted a license before this date, the initial license is valid for three years, regardless of whether or not they met the testing requirements.
- All license submitted on or after August 4, 2016, the initial license period is contingent on meeting the testing requirements in the statute. They must pass their exam by the end of their second year, or they are ineligible to teach in year three. August 15th of any given year is the last day of the year. If a teacher works 120-work days within the year, the teacher must complete the testing requirements.
- If a teacher does not meet the testing requirements in time, but completes all requirements in the year after, they can immediately re-enter and apply for an initial license.
- Dr. Oxendine asked what happens if the teacher takes the test, but does not have the results in July or August. Dr. Tomberlin responded that the district could wait until August 15 before the year technically ends.
- No additional comments were made.

This item is submitted for Discussion during the July 2017 State Board of Education meeting. (See Attachment ES&P 4)

ADJOURNMENT

Indicating no other business, ES&P Committee Chair Dr. Oxendine adjourned the July 2017 ES&P Committee meeting.

HEALTHY RESPONSIBLE STUDENTS COMMITTEE (Ms. Patricia Willoughby, Chair; Mr. Regional Kenan, Vice Chair)

HRS Committee Vice-Chair Reginald Kenan called the July 2017 Healthy Responsible Students (HRS) Committee meeting to order.

ACTION ON FIRST READING

HRS 1 – Middle School Athletic Manual Updates

Policy Implications:

SBE Strategic Plan

Goal 5: Every student is healthy, safe, and responsible

Objective 2: Promote healthy active lifestyles for students

Presenter(s): Dr. Maria Pitre-Martin (Deputy State Superintendent), Dr. Tiffany Perkins (Director, K-12 Curriculum and Instruction), and Dr. Ellen Essick (Section Chief, Healthy Schools)

Description:

Changes to the Middle/Junior High School Athletic Manual reflect recent policy, rule changes, and alignment with best practices for safety for student athletes.

Recommendations:

The State Board of Education is asked to review and comment on the proposed changes to the Manual.

Discussion/Comments:

- HSR Committee Vice-Chair Mr. Reginald Kenan recognized Dr. Ellen Essick to present this item.
- Dr. Essick presented updates to the middle school athletic manual. She explained that the new manual is divided into four sections – eligibility, health and safety, general rules and regulations, and sports regulations. Additional changes included technical modifications, and clarification of when sports practice can start in the fall. Dr. Essick explained that in the eligibility section, information about Gfeller Waller and the need for student physicals was added. A new section on health and safety was added that mirrors the NC High school athletic association rulebook – this section includes the regular health and safety rules plus a statement from the SBE that encourages LEAs to work towards having a licensed athletic trainer or a first responder at all school practices and games. The tobacco policy was also updated to include e-cigarettes. The General Rules section has information about professional development for coaches, including online training opportunities. As a final high-level change, Dr. Essick noted that this section also requires a physical before participation in skill development.

- Chairman Cobey observed that the changes seem extensive and he does not recall any previous presentation of an updated manual to the SBE. Dr. Essick explained that most of the changes involve a re-ordering of the content.
- Chairman Cobey asked if the manual is updated regularly online. Dr. Essick noted that it is updated any time the manual is updated by the SBE.
- Chairman Cobey asked for clarification about how the manual is distributed. Dr. Essick clarified that it's all done online, and there are not printed copies provided.
- Greg Alcorn thanked Dr. Essick for her work on the manual and asked if the middle school updates from a year ago are working and if the SBE made the right decision. Dr. Essick reported that 40 to 50 LEAs made to the move to include sixth graders in sports. That 20 or 30 are currently considering. Greg Alcorn asked Dr. Essick to confirm that football was excluded in this. She confirmed the same.
- No additional comments were made.

This item is submitted for Action on First Reading during the July 2017 State Board of Education meeting. (See Attachment HRS 1)

Upon motion by Mr. Reginald Kenan and seconded by Greg Alcorn, the Board voted unanimously to approve the Middle School Athletic Manual Updates, as presented. (See attachment HRS 1)

ACTION ON FIRST READING

HRS 2 – Request for SBE Approval of Rutherford County Board of Education Resolution to Establish and Implement a Pilot Program to Raise the Compulsory Attendance Age

Presenter(s): Dr. Maria Pitre-Martin (Deputy State Superintendent)

Description:

Pursuant to Section 8.21 of Session Law 2016.94, Rutherford County Schools is requesting approval from the State Board of Education to authorize Rutherford County Schools to establish and implement a pilot program to raise the compulsory attendance age from sixteen to eighteen years. The statute indicates that "the State Board of Education shall not authorize a pilot program under subsection (a) of this section in Rutherford County except upon receipt of a copy of a resolution adopted by the board of education for the Rutherford County Schools setting forth a date to begin establishment and implementation of the pilot program." The attachment to this agenda item includes the resolution adopted by the board of the Rutherford County Schools.

Recommendations:

It is recommended that the State Board of Education approve this resolution from Rutherford County Schools that will lead to the establishment of a pilot program to raise the compulsory attendance age in Rutherford County Schools.

Discussion/Comments:

- HSR Committee Vice-Chair Mr. Reginald Kenan recognized Dr. Maria Pitre-Martin to present this item.
- Dr. Pitre-Martin presented the Rutherford County Schools request for the SBE to authorize implementation of a pilot program to raise the compulsory attendance age from 16 to 18 years. The county school board has

already resolved to approve the pilot program beginning August 1, 2017. Dr. Pitre-Martin noted that HB 1030 gave the Rutherford County Schools the option to move forward on this pilot program.

- Chairman Cobey did not recall the legislation, but was aware of two other districts with similar pilot programs. He requested clarification on the other two counties. Dr. Pitre-Martin identified Hickory Public Schools and Newton-Conover City Schools as the other two systems. Chairman Cobey asked if Newton-Conover was permanently approved to for the 18-year-old compulsory age. Dr. Pitre-Martin acknowledged that they were included in the pilot, and shared her understanding that the school board would still bring a resolution to the SBE. She confirmed that all programs are pilot programs.
- No additional comments were made.

Upon motion by Mr. Reginald Kenan and seconded by Wayne McDevitt, the Board voted unanimously to approve the Middle School Athletic Manual Updates, as presented. (See attachment HRS 1)

This item is submitted for Action on First Reading during the July 2017 State Board of Education meeting. (See Attachment HRS 2)

Chairman Cobey noted that this concludes the committee meeting and voting on action items. He asked the SBE to bear with us a bit longer for a brief legislative update from Cecilia Holden. Chairman Cobey stated that Ms. Holden has kept the board informed on many legislative issues with emails, but this afternoon she will focus on a few topics on which she wants the SBE to be updated on. He noted that the legislature intends to come back into session on August 3rd and then again in September.

Chairman Cobey recognized Ms. Cecilia Holden for the Legislative Report.

➤ **Legislative Report**

❖ **Ms. Cecilia Holden (Legislative Director, NC State Board of Education)**

Ms. Holden followed up from Dr. Tammy Howard's presentation on the school performance grading scale. Ms. Holden noted that they had reached out to legislative staff who confirmed that the 15-point grading scale will still continue through the 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 school years. Ms. Holden shared that she will offer clarity on this item through the weekly legislative newsletter. She noted that 202 K-12 education-related bills are still being followed very closely. Ms. Holden summarized that 18 bills have been signed into law, 33 are contained in the budget bill that has now been signed into law, and 21 bills have been presented to the Governor for signature, but not yet been signed or vetoed. Finally, she noted there were three bills sent to conference before adjournment: an agency technical corrections bill; SB 628, which would exempt mobile classrooms from sales tax; and SB 335. Ms. Holden shared that the General Assembly has adjourned until August 3rd and will come back again on September 6th. A joint resolution will restrict business for both sessions. However, the General Assembly may consider any bill that would have met a particular deadline, and the agency technical corrections bill. Gubernatorial nominations or appointments can also be considered in August.

Ms. Holden stated that she has attempted to share with members updates on the high-level impacts of the budget. She noted that she will continue to bring the SBE information on any policy changes or local or state-level impacts at future meetings. Ms. Holden then proceeded to highlight and summarize the following legislation:

- SB 599, Excellent Educators for Every Classroom
- SB 335, Study/Fair Treatment of College Athletes
- HB 155, Omnibus Education Law Changes
- HB 894, Veterans/Health Care/Youth Suicide Prevention
- HB 800, Various Changes to Charter School Laws
- HB 866, School Bond Act

Vice-Chair Collins noted the sales tax exemption for mobile classrooms. He shared that nonprofits throughout the state, community colleges, everyone but local governments get sales tax exemptions despite the responsibility of local governments to provide school buildings.

Greg Alcorn asked Ms. Holden if there was any opportunity in technical corrections to resolve concerns surrounding the budget cuts. Wayne McDevitt noted that historically the answer is no. The General Assembly can put anything they want in to the bill, but 99.9% of technical corrections bills are technical. Greg Alcorn noted that we have a \$42 million budget going to \$38 million, and if nothing changes, the budget will decrease the following year to \$32 million. He questioned where it will stop, and if the resources we have will be able to fund the activities school systems need. Wayne McDevitt thanked Ms. Holden for keeping the SBE informed. He noted that he does read the bills, and that the SBE should continue to be aware of the relevant bills that are carried over. He reiterated that it is not just the budget bill, but special provisions that are significant. Wayne McDevitt commented that it will be a \$3.2 million cut this year, and \$6 million next year. He noted that the LEAs will be cut as well. He noted the need for strategic help for LEAs.

Chairman Cobey thanked Ms. Holden for her hard work during the legislative session. He expressed the SBE's thanks to the staff who assisted Ms. Holden in her legislative duties.

CHAIRMAN'S CLOSING COMMENTS

Chairman Cobey noted that he very pleased that our teachers, assistant principals, principals, and non-certified staff are receiving pay increases. These increases are important not only from a compensation standpoint, but also for retention of these professionals in the public school system. He stated that we will continue to work with the General Assembly on additional pay increases next year for school staff and for public education in general. A step that our legislature has already signaled to us will be a high priority next year.

The outcomes of a strong system – from pre-K, to K-12, to our community colleges and university system - form the backbone of a strong economy. A strong economy promotes a healthy civic climate and endless opportunities that help North Carolinians enjoy productive, healthy, and happy lives.

Ensuring positive outcomes by providing the services that our children need symbolizes our commitment to children and educators, and ensures what our Constitution says: "The people have a right to the privilege of an education, and it is our duty as a State to guard and maintain that right."

All of us at this table and in this Department, must be committed to imagining and developing programs that will train and retain quality teachers and school leaders who can ensure that our students leave the public schools with the analytical skills and thinking powers that will be needed in this global economy. He is particularly

appreciative that so much of what we talked about today and the comments that were made actually focuses on those analytical skills and ability to think things through in this changing world we're in.

We will need knowledge workers and skilled craftsmen who can be problem solvers of challenges that are beyond our present imagination or comprehension at this moment.

We face many months of hard work as we submit our ESSA plan and then begin implementation, and as we continue to collaborate and partner with our Legislators, our external partners, and our communities and families to make public education work for our children.

We all want the same outcome – a great state that is strong in all aspects – not just a state blessed with outstanding geography, but also a state that has the manpower and the will to face any challenge that might befall us, as well as the strength and the will to take advantage of the many great opportunities that will come our way.

Chairman Cobey noted that he looks forward to working with all of our partners in the coming months. After all, two of the grandest things that education provides us is Dreams and Hope – dreams of a fulfilling life as a worker, parent, and citizen and hope for a bright future and better tomorrows – and dreams and hopes are things that all of us can understand and appreciate.

CLOSED SESSION

Noting for the audience that the Board will immediately adjourn following its Closed Session, Chairman Cobey called for a motion to go into Closed Session.

Upon motion made by Vice Chairman A.L. Collins and seconded by Mr. Reginald Kenan, the Board voted unanimously to go into Closed Session to consult with attorneys on attorney-client privileged matters to discuss personnel and confidential matters, and to consider the handling of the following cases:

- *Williams vs. Eastern North Carolina School for the Deaf*
- *Atkins vs. Eastern North Carolina School for the Deaf*

ADJOURNMENT

Indicating no other business, Chairman Cobey requested a motion to adjourn.

Upon motion by _____ and seconded by, _____, Board members voted unanimously to adjourn the July 6, 2017, meeting of the State Board of Education.